

Why the Passion? : Bernard Lonergan on the Cross as Communication

Author: Mark T. Miller

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/2235>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2008

Copyright is held by the author, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise noted.

Boston College

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

Department of Theology

WHY THE PASSION?: BERNARD LONERGAN
ON THE CROSS AS COMMUNICATION

a dissertation

by

MARK T. MILLER

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

August 2008

Abstract

Why the Passion?: Bernard Lonergan, S.J. on the Cross as Communication
by Mark T. Miller, directed by Frederick Lawrence

This dissertation aims at understanding Bernard Lonergan's understanding of how the passion of Jesus Christ is salvific. Because salvation is of human persons in a community, a history, and a cosmos, the first part of the dissertation examines Lonergan's cosmology with an emphasis on his anthropology. For Lonergan the cosmos is a dynamic, interrelated hierarchy governed by the processes of what he calls "emergent probability." Within the universe of emergent probability, humanity is given the ability to direct world processes with critical intelligence, freedom, love, and cooperation with each other and with the larger world order. This ability is not totally undirected. Rather, it has a natural orientation, a desire or eros for ultimate goodness, truth, beauty, and love, i.e. for God. When made effective through an authentic, recurrent cycle of experience, questioning, understanding, judgment, decision, action, and cooperation, this human desire for God results in progress. However, when this cycle is damaged by bias, sin and its evil consequences distort the order of creation, both in human persons and in the larger environment. Over time, the effects of sin and bias produce cumulative, self-feeding patterns of destruction, or decline. In answer to this distortion, God gives humanity the gift of grace. Grace heals and elevates human persons. Through the self-gift of divine, unrestricted Love and the Incarnate Word, God works with human sensitivity, imagination, intelligence, affect, freedom, and community to produce religious, moral,

and intellectual conversion, and to form the renewed, renewing community Lonergan calls “cosmopolis” and the body of Christ.

Building on this cosmology and anthropology, the second part of the dissertation turns to the culmination of God’s solution to the problem of sin and evil in the suffering and death of Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, on the cross at Calvary. The cross does not redeem creation by destroying its order, nor does it redeem humanity by revoking its freedom. Rather, the cross redeems the world by *working with* the order and freedom of creation and humanity to *fulfill* their natural processes and purposes. Just as from all possible world orders, God chose the order of emergent probability and human freedom, from all possible ways of redeeming that order, God chose the way of the cross. How does the cross redeem a free humanity in a world of emergent probability? For Lonergan, the best way to understand the cross is through the analogy of communication. This communication is in two parts. First, the cross is a communication, primarily, of humanity to God. Lonergan calls this part “vicarious satisfaction.” He takes the general analogy from Anselm of Canterbury’s *Cur Deus Homo?*. But rather than understanding satisfaction primarily in an economic context of debt (as Anselm does), Lonergan situates it in the higher context of interpersonal psychology: Sin creates a rupture in the relationships between human persons and God, among human persons, and among all parts of creation. Christ’s vicarious satisfaction flows from a non-ruptured relationship. It expresses a perfect concord of the human and the divine, through its threefold communication of (1) a perfect knowledge and love of God and humanity, (2) a perfect knowledge and sorrow for the offense that sin is, (3) and a perfect knowledge and

detestation of the evil sin causes. Conceived as a communication in the context of ruptured interpersonal relationships, Lonergan's analogical understanding of the cross as vicarious satisfaction avoids Anselm's understanding's tendency to be misinterpreted as "satispassion" or "substitutionary penal atonement."

The other major part to Lonergan's analogy of the cross as communication is called the "Law of the Cross." While vicarious satisfaction is mainly Christ's achievement prescinding from the cooperation of human freedom in a world of emergent probability, the Law of the Cross proposes that Christ's crucifixion is an example and an exhortation to human persons. On the cross, Jesus wisely and lovingly transforms the evil consequences of sin into a twofold communication to humanity of a perfect human and divine (1) knowledge and love for humanity and (2) knowledge and condemnation of sin and evil. This twofold communication invites a twofold human response: the repentance of sin and a love for God and all things. This love and repentance form a reconciled relationship of God and humanity. Furthermore, when reconciled with God, a human person will tend to be moved to participate in Christ's work by willingly taking on satisfaction for one's own sin as well as the vicarious satisfaction for others' sins. Such participatory vicarious activity invites still other human persons to repent and reconcile with God and other persons, and furthermore to engage in their own participatory acts of satisfaction and communication. Thus, Christ's own work and human participation in his work are objective achievements as well as moving or inspiring examples. However, while Christ's work and our participation are moving, their movements do not operate by necessity. Nor are the appropriate human responses of repentance, love, personal

satisfaction, and vicarious satisfaction in any way forced upon human persons.

Consequently, the cross as communication operates in harmony with a world of emergent probability and in cooperation with human freedom. With the cross as communication, redemption is reconciliation, a reconciliation that spreads historically and communally by human participation in the divine initiative. This is God's solution to the problem of evil, according to Lonergan. Because God wills ultimately for human persons to be united to God and to all things by love, God wills freedom, and God allows the possibility of sin and evil. But sin and evil do not please God. Out of infinite wisdom, God did not do away with evil through power, but converted evil into a communication that preserves, works with, and fulfills the order of creation and the freedom of humanity.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Introduction

PART ONE: LONERGAN'S ANTHROPOLOGY, A THREEFOLD DIALECTIC OF HISTORY

Chapter 1. Progress: Nature as Good

- 1.1. Two Views on Nature: Classical and Historical
- 1.2. Emergent Probability: A Dynamic World Order
 - 1.2.1. Determinism, Indeterminism, and Emergent Probability
 - 1.2.2. Classical and Statistical Law
 - 1.2.3. Schemes of Recurrence: Emergence and Survival
 - 1.2.4. A Dynamic, Interdependent Hierarchy:
Transcendence, Sublation, and Vertical Finality
- 1.3. Insight and The Self-Correcting Process of Learning
 - 1.3.1. Insight into Insight
 - 1.3.2. Insight and Progress: Common Sense and Science
 - 1.3.3. Common Sense, Sensitivity, and Spontaneous Intersubjectivity
- 1.4. Transcendental Method: The Larger Picture of Self-Transcendence
 - 1.4.1. Four Levels of Conscious Intentionality
 - 1.4.1.1. Experience
 - 1.4.1.2. Understanding
 - 1.4.1.3. Judgment: Fact and Value
 - 1.4.1.4. Decision, Freedom, and Moral Self-Transcendence
 - 1.4.2. Authenticity: Transcendental Precepts, Notions, and Desire
- 1.5. The Cooperating Human Community
 - 1.5.1. Love
 - 1.5.2. The Way From Above Downwards
 - 1.5.3. The World Mediated by Meaning and Belief
 - 1.5.4. The Human Good
 - 1.5.5. Realms of Meaning

Chapter 2. Decline: Nature as Fallen

- 2.1. Sin and Evil
- 2.2. Bias
 - 2.2.1. Dramatic Bias
 - 2.2.2. Individual Bias: Egoism
 - 2.2.3. Group Bias: Group Egoism
 - 2.2.4. General Bias: Shortsightedness

- 2.3. Decline
 - 2.3.1. Shorter Cycle
 - 2.3.2. Longer Cycle

Chapter 3. Redemption: Nature Raised into Supernature

- 3.1. Grace
 - 3.1.1. The Supernatural—Relatively and Absolutely
 - 3.1.2. Healing and Elevating Grace
- 3.2. Conversion
 - 3.2.1. Religious Conversion
 - 3.2.1.1. Charity
 - 3.2.1.2. Faith
 - 3.2.1.3. Hope
 - 3.2.2. Moral Conversion
 - 3.2.3. Intellectual Conversion and Myths about Knowing
- 3.3. A Redemptive Community
 - 3.3.1. Cosmopolis
 - 3.3.2. The Body of Christ

PART TWO: LONERGAN’S SOTERIOLOGY, UNDERSTANDING THE MYSTERY

Chapter 1. Understanding Redemption?

- 1.1. Mystery
- 1.2. The Type of Intelligibility Sought
 - 1.2.1. Fittingness, not Necessity
 - 1.2.2. A Dynamic Intelligibility
 - 1.2.3. Incarnate Intelligibility
 - 1.2.4. A Complex Intelligibility
 - 1.2.5. Multiple Intelligibility
- 1.3. An Analogical Understanding

Chapter 2. Redemption in the New Testament: Basic Analogies

- 2.1. Redemption as Word, End, and Mediation
 - 2.1.1. The Word, *Redemption*
 - 2.1.2. Redemption as an End
 - 2.1.3. Redemption as a Mediation of Reconciliation
- 2.2. Paying a Price
- 2.3. Vicarious Suffering and Death
- 2.4. Sacrifice
- 2.5. Meritorious Obedience
- 2.6. The Risen Lord and Eternal Priest

Chapter 3. Christ's Work as Satisfaction: A Communication Primarily to God

- 3.1. The Context: Satisfaction vs. Satispassion
 - 3.1.1. Satispassion, a Misunderstanding
 - 3.1.2. Anselm's Satisfaction
- 3.2. Lonergan's Satisfaction: A Communication of Detestation and Sorrow
 - 3.2.1. Satisfaction and Divine Justice
 - 3.2.1.1. The Divine Will, World Order, and Punishment
 - 3.2.1.2. Two Contexts for Punishment: Retribution and Satisfaction
 - 3.2.2. Satisfaction and Friendship
 - 3.2.2.1. Vicarious Satisfaction and Friendship
 - 3.2.2.2. The Supernatural Friendship of Charity
 - 3.2.3. Christ's Satisfaction and Christian Satisfaction

Chapter 4. The Law of the Cross: A Communication Primarily to Humanity

- 4.1. Why a *Law* of the Cross?
 - 4.1.1. The Four Causes and Redemption: Introducing a Form
 - 4.1.2. A Spiritual Law: Supernatural, Fitting, Effective, and Universal
- 4.2. Doing Away with Evil through Power vs. Converting Evil with Love and Wisdom
 - 4.2.1. Clarification by Contrast
 - 4.2.2. An Act of Divine Wisdom and Love
- 4.3. A Communication Forming Community
 - 4.3.1. The Foundation: The Incarnation
 - 4.3.2. The Law of the Cross as Precept: Christ's Life
 - 4.3.3. The Law of the Cross as Example: Christ's Death
 - 4.3.4. The Law of the Cross as Promise: Christ's Resurrection
 - 4.3.5. Divine Love and the New Society
 - 4.3.5.1. Bringing Out Love by Incarnate Meaning
 - 4.3.5.2. Self-Communication for Life in the Trinity

Conclusion

Acknowledgements

Like all good things for which one takes credit, this dissertation truly has been a team effort. When I reflect on the many, many people without whom I could not have completed this work, I am tempted to thank the communion of saints, living and dead, united with God. And due to the interconnection of people, only this broad an expression of gratitude could do justice to the great breadth of help I have received. As a good friend reminds me, without the sandwiches he ate, he could not do his work. So in anything he does, he must thank everyone who nourished him, including the migrant worker who picked the tomatoes that went into his sandwiches.

While the breadth of people who have contributed to my nourishment is great, there are certainly those whose depth of influence and assistance merits at least a special mention. Foremost among these are my parents. My mother has taught at Catholic, Jewish, and Methodist schools. My father directed Catholic Charities in Nevada for twenty-five years. Together they have been tremendous witnesses to the great good that religion and education can bring to the world. Their regular conversations with me continue to edify and encourage me. I sometimes tell friends that I survive on the strength of my mother's prayer.

In my formal education too, I have been blessed with great teachers. Sr. Lorraine Forster, my high school biology teacher, has believed in me since I was a first grader walking through the high school halls on the way to grade school. The education I received at Georgetown University's foreign service school has set the context for my

theological questions. Studies there were driven by the desire to arrest and prevent conflict and oppression on all levels of society. I credit the Catholic, Jesuit tradition for providing invaluable principles for addressing these problems. Professors such as Otto Hentz, SJ, James Walsh, SJ, and Alvaro Ribeiro, SJ, directed me to find God in all things, to wed contemplation and action, and to listen to God's call in my heart's deepest desires. For the past fifteen years, the Rev. Raymond B. Kemp has been a theological mentor, spiritual director, general role model, and constant friend since he introduced me to Lonergan's *Method* in his course "Struggle and Transcendence."

At Boston College, Fred Lawrence has truly been a "Doktorvater," allowing me to catch a glimpse of theological and philosophical heights I never knew were possible. He and his wife, Sue, have exemplified the kind of partnership I hope one day to have. Shawn Copeland and Charles Hefling have enriched my reading of Lonergan and theology immensely and were kind enough to help me produce this dissertation and land a wonderful job. I am particularly grateful to Prof. Hefling for allowing me to use his unpublished translation of Lonergan's *De Verbo Incarnato*. Additionally, Stephen Brown, Louis Roy, Robert Daly, Mary Ann Hinsdale, Harvey Egan, Patrick Byrne, Joseph Flanagan, Michael Himes, Michael Buckley, and several other professors at BC and Weston have helped me immeasurably both in and outside of the classroom. Howard Gray, Gap LoBiondo, Gary Gurtler, and Julio Giulietti have been wonderful spiritual directors and sparing partners. Without them, and without Claudette Picklesimer, Shirley Gee, Gloria Rufo, and Tony Ross, I would not have finished graduate work.

The same is true for those with whom I have been fortunate enough to have lived these past several years: members of BC's IREPM, the Firestone family, Fr. Wendell Verrill and St. Mary's Parish, Rene (tomatoes and migrant workers) Sanchez, Ara Dileepan, and Scott Agulo, and the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales. Many great friends and family members have supported me as well, particularly my brothers, Paul and John, my sister Theresa, their families, my Aunt Mimi and Uncle Maurice, relatives in Maine and Manila, Gina Alfonso, Suzanne Hevalone, Tracy Tiemeier, Grank Kaplan, Javier Romero-Avila, Joe Mudd, Jeremy Wilkins, Karen Teel, Joe Cioni, Matt Petillo, Jennifer Kreis, Patrick Clark, Christian Krokus, Eric Johnston, Kevin Vander Schel, Kathryn Getek, Ray Ward, David and Angela Franks, Randy Rosenberg, Pyong-Gwan Pak, Thaddeus Ostrowski, Beth Beshear, Jinyong Choi, Sonja Bardelang, the community of Sant'Egidio, the Philippine Society of Boston College, Ricco Siasoco, the Boston Filipino mass community, Chris Lee, Erik Young, Chris and Jennifer Jacobs-Vandegeer, Dorothy Cummings, and the Nagims.

Many people involved with Lonergan studies in Boston and Toronto have been generous with their time, friendship, and resources: Kerry Cronin, Bob Doran, Gilles Mongeau, Peter Bisson, Gordon Rixon, Michael Shields, Jennifer Kendall, Bob Crokin, Danny Monsour, and others.

Most of the dissertation work was completed in Washington, DC, where I was aided by many people associated with the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales and Georgetown University, particularly the Woodstock Theological Center. To the former group belong such friends as Jim Greenfield, Kevin Nadowski, John Foster

(proofreader!), Jonathan Wisneski, Mike Castrilli, Marc Girardi, Joe Everson, Hugh O'Malley, Andre Johnson, and Mark Plaushin. To the latter belong Gaspar LoBiondo (thank you for the Ignatian direction these many years!), John Haughey, Tom Reece, Willie Walsh, Patrick Heelan, John Haught, Richard Liddy, Nelle Temple Brown, Rita Rodriguez, and Dolores Leckey of Woodstock, and Allan Mitchell, Julia Lamm, Peter Phan, and Terry Reynolds of the theology department, as well as my wonderful students in *The Good Life*.

Introduction

How does Christ's cross save? This is the primary question driving this dissertation. The tortured body of Jesus Christ nailed to the cross is the primary symbol for Christian understanding of God's relationship to humanity and the world. This is particularly true for the Catholic church, whose churches, classrooms, and members display the crucifixion on their walls and around their necks. At the beginning and end of our prayer, whether alone or in community, we make the Sign of the Cross, tracing its image over heads, hearts, and shoulders.

In doctrine as well as in practice, the church affirms the salvific significance of Christ's suffering and death, his passion.¹ *That* the cross saves is a central teaching of the Christianity, but we must ask *how* does it save? The exigency for understanding how the crucifixion works comes from both a natural human desire to know and to understand, but also from the practical implications of human knowledge and understanding.

In terms of the need for knowledge and understanding, the affirmation that the cross saves is problematic for human hearts and minds. When viewed in relation to other teachings, such as the unity of God, the infinite wisdom of God, the unconditional love of God, and the omnipotence of God, we might wonder such things as, What is the role of the Father in the Son's passion? Why would God choose to redeem the world through

¹ Henry Denzinger, *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, trans. Roy Deferrari (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1957), 2, 6, 54, 86, 302, 304.

the cross? Additionally, the persistence and perhaps the intensification of suffering, sin, and evil in the world might well give rise to such questions as, What actual effect(s) has the cross had, if any, on human history?

We cannot help but to wonder, to seek answers to our questions. Moreover, we cannot help but to *live* by our answers. In other words, there are practical applications to our theories. For example, if one chooses to believe that the Father demanded the death of the Son to quench his thirst for human punishment, one might be tempted to abandon Christianity: Why would one worship this bloodthirsty, unjust, and perhaps even sadistic God? Why would one belong to a community that worshiped such a God?

A turn toward atheism is just one possible result of poor understanding of Christian redemption. In the efforts to salvage one's belief in God, one might turn to a number of other misunderstandings of God's relationship to the crucifixion. For example, if one still believed in God, and if one thought that all power was like military power, one might conclude that God is not all-powerful, since God died on the cross, and sin and evil persist in the world. Thus, one might retreat to an image of God as a helpless but loving parent, watching our misery with a shared misery. Conversely, if one wished to hold on to the belief that God is omnipotent, one might abandon either the belief in divine love and wisdom, or the belief that divine love and wisdom bear any relation to human love and wisdom. Either way, one would conclude that God acts not only in Christ's suffering on the cross but also in the sins of his tormentors.

What are the possible consequences of such possible notions about God and God's relationship to sin, evil, and suffering? In my view, the consequences would be

enormous, for we live according to our answers and beliefs, not merely in our private lives as avowed theists or atheists, but also in our actions in relationship with others. Those who perceive and accept the Father as imposing suffering in an unjust, cruel way might take this as their ideal, imitate this God, and impose suffering unjustly and cruelly. On the other hand, those who perceive the Son as passively receiving unjust suffering to please a sadistic Father might imitate the Son and passively accept being oppressed themselves. Such understandings of the cross might also affect the actions of third party witnesses to oppression. What kind of consolation could one offer to another in that person's moments of suffering, if one believed either that God was powerless or that God was completely responsible? Furthermore, if one sought to explain the cross by claiming its wisdom and intelligibility are totally foreign to human wisdom and intelligibility, one might separate totally one's faith and one's reason. Given this division, some would choose sides rather than try to reconcile what has been determined irreconcilable. The practical and political consequences of this separation would be far-reaching. For how would those who rejected the Christian God and Christian communities related to Christian belief and Christian believers?

Such possibilities are not merely abstract, and such questions are not merely academic, in my opinion. They have had a tremendous impact on human history, and they will continue to influence the world, for our practice is in part based on our understanding. If we are to continue to affirm that the cross saves and that it is truly the work of God—the product of infinite wisdom, love, and power—then we must seek a proper understanding of how the cross saves. It is also my opinion that the work of Jesuit

theologian Bernard Lonergan provides a helpful, satisfactory way of understanding this teaching in a way that does justice to divine wisdom, love, and power, as well as to the current state of the human affairs in the world, a state that remains sinful

As we have seen, how the cross saves is complicated. Lonergan affirms that it is not only complicated, but also a mystery, for three reasons: (1) it comes from infinite wisdom and goodness, (2) it reveals “the mystery of human iniquity,” and (3) it reveals the relationship between divine wisdom and goodness and human iniquity.²

This dissertation is an effort to understand this complicated mystery by understanding Lonergan’s understanding.³ But how can we understand a mystery? For this, I rely, as Lonergan does, on the statements of Vatican I in chapter four of the

Dogmatic Constitution concerning the Catholic Faith:

[R]eason illustrated by faith, when it zealously, piously, and soberly seeks, attains with the help of God some understanding of the mysteries, and that a most profitable one, not only from the analogy of those things which it knows naturally, but also from the connection of the mysteries among themselves and with the last end of man; nevertheless it is never capable of perceiving those mysteries in the way it does the truths which constitute its own proper object. Lonergan writes that such fruitful understanding of mystery “rests on the analogy

² Bernard Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, Third edition (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 1964), 557. I rely on Charles Hefling’s excellent translation, henceforth to be referred to as “*DVI* (trans., Hefling).” Please note that in this list, the term “mystery” is used differently for infinite wisdom and goodness as for human iniquity. Divine wisdom and goodness are intelligible beyond human knowing, but sin is unintelligible in itself. More will be said in the first chapter of the second part.

³ The question may arise as to which of Lonergan’s eight functional specialties this work is located. While its primary goal is to understand the doctrine of redemption, and thus would seem to be an effort in the specialty called “systematics,” I have not put in the painstaking work to understand and evaluate many other authors’ contributions to the field (though part 1, chapter 3 does try to account for one major line of understanding). Thus, this work is largely a work in “interpretation” that focuses on understanding Lonergan’s systematics. Additionally, I have sought keep my writing style clear, well-organized, and relatively comprehensive in order that the work might be accessible to those not very familiar with Lonergan. For more on Lonergan’s functional specialties, see Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), particularly Chs. 7, 13-14.

of things known naturally and on the interconnection of the mysteries with one another and with man's last end.⁴

Just as the mystery the cross is complicated, so too is Lonergan's understanding of it complicated. It involves multiple analogies, and it can only be understood in light of Lonergan's complicated cosmology and anthropology. The cross, after all, is God's solution to the problem of sin and evil in creation, and particularly in human persons and human communities, as they exist in creation and in history. Consequently, I believe that to understand Lonergan's understanding of the cross, it is essential to understand Lonergan's understanding of creation in general and of humanity in particular.

In line with this belief, the dissertation is divided into two main parts, the first on Lonergan's cosmology and anthropology, and the second on his soteriology. The first part consists of three chapters, *Progress*, *Decline*, and *Redemption*. These correspond to the traditional categories of nature, sin, and grace. For Lonergan, these elements are related dynamically in the world as it exists. The second part contains four chapters. The first examines Lonergan's notion of *Mystery*. The second chapter considers some *Basic Analogies* taken from scripture. The remaining two chapters consider Lonergan's primary analogies for gaining some measure of fruitful understanding of Christ's work on the cross, namely, *Satisfaction* and *the Law of the Cross*.

⁴ Denzinger, 1796.

PART 1. LONERGAN'S ANTHROPOLOGY:**A THREEFOLD DIALECTIC OF HISTORY**

This dissertation seeks to understand better the mystery of salvation by Christ's death on the cross. Toward that end, we seek to understand Bernard Lonergan's understanding of the mystery. Because the cross is a solution to a problem, I believe it is indispensable to consider first the problem for which the cross is a solution. That problem is the human situation.

Consequently, this initial part of the dissertation will present a basic yet solid introduction to Lonergan's thought on humanity, his anthropology. It seeks to answer the question: If the cross is to save humanity in this world, then what is humanity and its world like? My aim is to summarize Lonergan's anthropology in as clear and as simple a manner as this difficult and complicated topic allows. Lonergan was a profound thinker. A committed Roman Catholic philosopher and theologian, his thought was catholic in the broader sense, too, seeking to account for and to affirm all that is true about a topic. While this alone would be a major achievement, Lonergan's thought attempts to go one step further: to discover and to present the complex network that relates these truths. Thus, Lonergan's anthropology endeavors to account for all that is true about humanity and to present these truths and their relations in a systematic fashion.

Of course, Lonergan could not account for everything there is to know about being human. Instead, his analysis yielded general categories that account for human

achievement and for human failure on the individual level, on a communal level, and on an historical level. My presentation of Lonergan's anthropology follows what I take to be the largest, most encompassing framework, that of his tripolar dialectic of history:⁵ progress, decline, and redemption.

Lonergan came upon this tripolar dialectic early in his studies, in the late 1930's, and it remained a recurring theme throughout his work. Progress, decline, and redemption answer questions about human living that were pressing for Lonergan during a worldwide economic depression and the build-up to World War II. In this context, Lonergan wondered about the underlying causes for such catastrophic historical change.

On a global scale, Liberalism and Marxism were the most influential systems of thought competing for dominance in the realm of social organization and direction. Lonergan thought that the core of these theories was their philosophy of history, and he felt that both were inadequate for guiding long-term social progress, since both of them failed to acknowledge the evils of egoism and the need for a supernatural or religious component in history.⁶

The liberalism that arose in the eighteenth century advocated progress, but it also contained a mistaken faith in individual self-interest, thinking that unfettered, competitive

⁵ In his work *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 749, Lonergan mentions the shift to a tripolar dialectic with the addition of the supernatural dimension of redemption. He does not comment on the oddity of a dialectic with more than two principles. However, previously in the book, on page 242, he discusses many different definitions of dialectic. For Plato it is philosophical dialogue contrasted with eristic, or specious reasoning. For Aristotle it is a process of reviewing opinions to discover the truth. Only in Hegel and Marx is it an opposition of two poles to produce a third. Lonergan's own definition is "a concrete unfolding of linked but opposed principles of change."

⁶ As early as 1933 or 34 Lonergan wrote, "[T]he hope of the future lies in a philosophic presentation of the supernatural concept of social order..." in an unpublished essay called "The Philosophy of History," p. 117, as quoted by Michael Shute in *The Origins of Lonergan's Notion of the Dialectic of History* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993), 59, ft. 70.

egoism could drive automatic progress.⁷ The Marxism ascendant in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries correctly criticized some aspects of liberalism, but it was flawed in its belief that the group self-interest of a revolutionary proletariat and its expression in violent class conflict would accelerate progress and produce an ideal classless and stateless society.⁸ While the early twentieth century was marked by rapid material progress, it saw unparalleled totalitarianism, violence, and horror.

Between the two World Wars and during the Great Depression, Lonergan strove to understand human history in order to facilitate ethical action in global society, or more specifically a “Christian praxis.”⁹ In 1937-38, he had a breakthrough when he adopted an analogy from Newton's analysis of the motion of planets.¹⁰ The advantage of Newton's analysis was that it explained a complex movement or a concrete, dynamic process. No less than the motions of the planets, human history is a complex, concrete, and dynamic process.

Newton explained the irregular ellipses of each planet's motion by abstracting three distinct forces. He conceived of each of these forces as moving in straight lines, or

⁷ Lonergan thought liberals were right to speak of progress, but wrong to believe it could be driven merely by self-interest, for in a capitalist context even “enlightened self-interest easily comes to mean really profitable self-interest” (Bernard Lonergan, “Questionnaire on Philosophy: Response,” *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 368. Cf., *Insight*, 260, 710-11; Shute, 6-7.).

⁸ *Insight*, 260, 265-66, “Questionnaire,” 366-70.

⁹ “Questionnaire,” 370. Lonergan follows Aristotle in contrasting *praxis* and *poesis*, doing and making, conduct and product. Praxis is a kind of practice, the deliberation, choice, and conduct that falls “under the guidance of the practical wisdom that Aristotle named *phronesis* and Aquinas named *prudentia*.” In this Lonergan would include the praxis of liberation theology. Bernard Lonergan, “Theology and Praxis,” *A Third Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 184.

¹⁰ Bernard Lonergan, “Insight Revisited,” *A Second Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), 271.

“vectors.”¹¹ The three vectors accounted for the *differences* in planetary motion, and are, therefore, also known as “differentials.”¹² Individually, none of the three straight vectors, or differentials, corresponded to the actual, elliptical movement of the planets. But together, in a unified theory, they explained the concrete motion of the planets in a way that was reasonably accurate and empirically verifiable.

Like the reality of the planets, human reality is in motion. It is a history. To study it, Lonergan appropriated Newton’s vector or differential analysis. Thus, Lonergan’s philosophy of history is comprised of three vectors or differentials: *progress*, *decline*, and *redemption*. These three differentials are a transposition of the three traditional, rather static, metaphysical categories of *nature*, *sin*, and *grace*, into a more dynamic and historical context. Taken individually, none of them provides an accurate account of human history. They are abstractions of partial, particular aspects of that complex reality. But taken together as a dynamic whole, they provide a full and highly verifiable framework for Lonergan’s anthropology.

Lonergan’s anthropology provides key concepts that will be fundamental to our understanding of Lonergan’s soteriology; consequently, we shall examine it in some detail. Our starting point is nature in general. Nature for Lonergan is an intricate, interdependent order in which lower orders set the conditions for the possibility of new,

¹¹ The three Newtonian vectors are: 1. the forward momentum of moving bodies, i.e., the law of inertia, 2. the pull of gravity between the sun and each planets, 3. the pull of gravity among planets. Together the three vectors result in the irregular ellipses in which the planets actually move. Ibid. For more background information on Lonergan’s development of the dialectic of history, see Shute; Richard Liddy, *Transforming Light: Intellectual Conversion in the Early Lonergan* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1993) 84-87; William A. Mathews, *Lonergan’s Quest, A Study of Desire in the Authoring of Insight* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 88-92.

¹² Lonergan discusses the role of differentials in a context of mathematics in *Insight*, 42, 62-4. In *Topics in Education* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 27, he says simply, “What makes the difference in the human good at different times we call a differential.”

more complicated, and higher orders to emerge. Human beings are relatively late developments. They (We) are subject to natural laws, but by their experiences, intelligences, judgments, decisions, and actions they can not only discover the course of creation but also contribute to its direction and unfolding. Driving these human operations is a fundamental desire, a natural desire for sense stimulation, understanding, knowledge, moral responsibility, and love. This desire is one, because ultimately it is a desire for God. Authentic operation involves a fidelity to this good natural desire. Lonergan situates human individuals and their operations in human communities and in human history. Authentic individual operation and authentic social cooperation drive progress.

Human individuals, communities, and histories can be authentic, but they (we) can also fail in their operations and cooperations. This failure is sin. It causes and is caused by bias. As authentic operations shape and are shaped by human communities, so too does inauthentic activity have negative consequences on human societies, and the resultant negative situations increase the probability of further failure, sin, and inauthenticity. Over history, this causes decline.

But the concrete human situation is a product not simply of nature and sin but also of grace. In the world as it exists, God has given us the divine redeeming love, a love that bears fruit in conversion—a healing of nature from the effects of sin and an elevation to the supernatural virtues of faith, hope, and charity. Redemption is not merely an individual affair. It takes place in a graced community, the church, the Body of Christ. Its goal is the total redemption of all humankind.

We shall consider nature, sin, and grace in terms of progress, decline, and redemption. Within each chapter the movement is from the basic to the complex, from basic metaphysical generalities to individual persons to human communities to communities in history. Each chapter and section builds on the previous section(s) or chapter(s). For example, the principle of emergent probability is discussed as a general metaphysical principle in nature, then this principle is applied to the human person, human societies, and human history, as natural, sinful, and graced.

Chapter 1. Progress: Nature as Good

1.1. Two Views on Nature: Classical and Historical

Progress is Lonergan's transposition of classical, static, and abstract concepts of nature into a newer, dynamic, and historical context.¹³ This transposition of the classical view of nature into an historical framework is neither a total repudiation nor a complete elimination of that earlier view. The transposition is more of a "transcendence"¹⁴ of that view. In other words, Lonergan's account of the human person includes aspects of both classical definitions of human nature and more contemporary ideas about humanity as historical. The historicity of humanity forms the larger context for the study of human nature, but both are valuable, as Lonergan said at a 1977 address to The American Catholic Philosophical Association: "A contemporary ontology would distinguish between two components in the concrete human reality: on the one hand, a constant

¹³ Lonergan once said that his whole work had been to introduce history into theology. *Curiosity at the Center of One's Life: Statements and questions of R. Eric O'Connor*, Ed. J. Martin O'Hara (Montreal: Thomas More institute, 1984) 427. See also, Frederick E. Crowe, "All my work has been introducing history into Catholic theology," *Lonergan Workshop: The Legacy of Lonergan*, vol. 10, ed. Frederick Lawrence (1994): 49-81.

¹⁴ "Transcendence" is a central term in Lonergan's work. Basically, it means "going beyond." One thing can go beyond another in a way that the first has nothing to do with the second. However, for Lonergan transcendence indicates that a second thing goes beyond a first by lifting the first into a greater and richer context that preserves and fulfills the first's proper features. This view of transcendence is closely related to the term, "sublation," as used by Karl Rahner, the German, Jesuit theologian and contemporary of Lonergan. *Method*, 241. See also Bernard Lonergan, "Horizons," *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 23. This was a lecture given at the Thomas More Institute, Montreal in 1968. During a question and answer period that followed, Lonergan contrasts transcendence in cognitive theory and theories of relationships with an immanence that knows only appearances and leads to relativism and atomistic individualism.

human nature; on the other hand, a variable human history. Nature is given man at birth. Historicity is what man makes of man.”¹⁵ Both are valid.

Lonergan regards highly Aristotle’s classical view of human nature as the *zôon logikon*¹⁶ and the *zôon politikon*,¹⁷ the “logical” or “rational animal” and the “political” or “social animal.” As rational and social animals, humans are complex realities. Like all of being, human beings are governed by metaphysical laws; like all of being that is in motion, human beings are governed by physical laws; like all of being in self-motion, or life, human beings are subject to biological laws; like all sensitive beings in self-motion, or animals, human beings are subject to zoological laws.¹⁸ However, we human beings are unique, according to Aristotle’s classical view of human nature, inasmuch as we are rational (obey the rules of reason and conceive of rational rules)¹⁹ and social (the good life is lived in community with friends).²⁰ As rational and social, humans attain their end, i.e., happiness, primarily through friendship and *arête*, which is translated as “virtue” or “excellence.”²¹

Lonergan’s view of the human person is to some degree based on these elements of Aristotle’s classical conception of human nature: a complex being governed by rules

¹⁵ Bernard Lonergan “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” *A Third Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 170. Lonergan’s thought on history was influenced by his reading of Christopher Dawson’s *The Age of the Gods* in the early 1930’s and Arnold Toynbee’s *A Study of History* in 1940-41. See Liddy, 84; Mathews, 50-51, 110-11.

¹⁶ Aristotle, *De Anima*, III. Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 80.

¹⁷ Aristotle, *The Politics*, I. 2, 1253a3. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, I. 7, 1097b11. Lonergan, *Insight*, 211.

¹⁸ *De Anima*, II.

¹⁹ *Nicomachean Ethics*, I. 7, 1098a4.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Bks. I and IX.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Bk. I. In addition to virtue and friendship, Aristotle names other requirements for happiness including health, some measure of respect from one’s peers, a moderate amount of material goods, and friends (including family) who are virtuous, healthy, respected, and a moderate amount of material goods.

affecting beings; an animal that is rational, social, and capable of attaining excellence.

This forms some of the basis for Lonergan's thinking of the human person as human nature or human substance. But Lonergan acknowledges that there are limits to this type of thought. It does not tell us much about the actual, concrete person, or what Lonergan sometimes calls the human subject:

Of the human substance it is true that human nature is always the same; a man is a man whether he is awake or asleep, young or old, sane or crazy, sober or drunk, a genius or a moron, a saint or a sinner. From the viewpoint of substance, those differences are merely accidental. But they are not accidental to the subject, for the subject is not an abstraction; he is a concrete reality, all of him, a being in the luminosity of being.... The being of a subject is becoming.²²

Consequently, Lonergan believes that any adequate account of humanity, any anthropology that wishes to study humanity in its concreteness, must consider the human being in flux. It must be an historical anthropology. We shall examine the first part of Lonergan's historical anthropology, i.e., progress, in four parts: 1) emergent probability, 2) intelligence, 3) authenticity, and 4) the human good.

Lonergan defined progress as "*a cyclic and cumulative process in which concrete situations give rise to insights, insights to new courses of action, new courses of action to changed situations, and changed situations to still further insights.*"²³ The following section on *emergent probability* will explain what Lonergan means by "concrete situations" and "a cyclical and cumulative process." It will present the global or cosmological context of what is strictly human or anthropological. The next section focuses on the "rise" of "insights." Our third section on *transcendental method* relates

²² Bernard Lonergan, "Existenz and Aggiornamento," *Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick Crowe (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 241.

²³ "Questionnaire," 366, emphasis added.

insight to experience, knowledge, choice, and “action.” The chapter’s final section on the *cooperating human community* will discuss how the concrete situation, the cyclical and cumulative process, the rise of insights, and the courses of action are all related in a nexus that is social, cultural, and historical.

1.2. Emergent Probability: A Dynamic World Order

Human beings are part of whole. This whole is sometimes called a “world.” The world sets the basic conditions and norms for the possibility of human progress.²⁴ Thus, a study of human nature and history, of human being and becoming, must be situated in the larger, more fundamental context of the world’s nature and history, its being and becoming. In other words, an anthropology is situated within a cosmology.

According to Lonergan, cosmology is of two types: “It may be placed in universal propositions, self-evident truths, naturally known certitudes. On the other hand, it may be placed in nature itself, in nature not as abstractly conceived, but as concretely operating. It is, I believe, the second alternative that has to be envisaged if we are to determine norms in historicity.”²⁵ In this section we to answer such questions as, How does the world operate concretely? What are its norms? How do these operations and norms ground human progress?

1.2.1. Determinism, Indeterminism, and Emergent Probability

Emergent probability is Lonergan’s term for the operation of a world process that sets some norms for human life and for human progress. To gain a clearer view of emergent probability it is helpful to contrast it with an opposed worldview: mechanistic

²⁴ Although, humans also have the ability to transform the world, as following sections will discuss.

²⁵ “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” 172.

determinism. Mechanistic determinism is a classical, but still common, theory that conceives of the world as a closed, controlled system. Everything important in the world has existed since its beginning, and the relations of all things are predetermined from the beginning of the world. These relations are expressed in unchanging, universal, and necessary laws.²⁶

Such a worldview is compatible with a kind of theism, in particular the deism popular in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and embraced by America's founding fathers. The deistic image of God is that of a removed watchmaker. For the creation process, deism imagines that the individual forms of things or "Plato's ideas are in the divine mind pretty much as the animals were in Noah's ark."²⁷ It conceives of finite natures as prior to world orders. The relationships of things in a world order are necessary and determined by the individual natures of finite things, as required by the finite things' natures.

In contrast, Lonergan's worldview of emergent probability affirms that world order is prior to finite natures. "God sees in his essence, first of all, the series of all possible world-orders each complete down to its least historical detail" and in knowing world orders, God knows finite natures.²⁸ By placing the priority on world orders, Lonergan is able to understand the world as dynamic. The finite natures of individual

²⁶ To some degree this view has its roots in Aristotle, who distinguished between necessary and contingent laws and believed that the necessary movements of the heavens caused contingent movements on the earth. It was furthered by Galileo's distinction between secondary causes that are mere appearance, known by the senses, and primary qualities that are objective and known mathematically. Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume made abstract classical rules concrete, thus completing the mechanistic worldview. *Insight*, 138, 151-54. See *Method*, 280.

²⁷ Bernard Lonergan, "The Natural Desire to See God," *Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.: Papers by Bernard Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick Crowe (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 88.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

things do not fix the relationships of things and thus do not require a static world order. A dynamic world order with its own intrinsic intelligibility provides for the emergence of new things. What is that world order?

In some ways, it is similar to Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. Since Darwin (1809-82), natural science has understood that the world is not populated by a fixed, unchanging assembly of plant and animal species. New plants and new animals emerge, and existing ones become extinct. Further more, their emergence and extinction is not based on necessity but on *probability*. The probability for new life-forms to emerge or not to emerge, to survive or to become extinct, depends on a host of underlying factors in the natural environment. These underlying factors do not exist in the same amounts in different places and at different times. Thus, the probabilities for a plant's or an animal's emergence and survival are not universal but localized.²⁹ Darwin's discoveries and several successive advances, notably by Freud in psychology and Einstein in physics, have contributed to a general discrediting of mechanistic determinism. Consequently, despite the persistent temptation, contemporary thinkers may no longer imagine the world as a watch with all its parts related and governed by unchanging, universal, and necessary laws.³⁰

However, there is a temptation to move from the one extreme of mechanistic determinism to another, a relativistic indeterminism. According to this latter view there is no worldview; there is no world order; there are no intelligible relationships, necessary or

²⁹ *Insight*, 154-55.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 448-49. Freud discovered that psychological disease has properly psychological causes. Einstein's quantum mechanics "removed from science the relevance of any image of particles, or waves, or continuous process." Cf., *Method*, 280 where Lonergan discusses such changes in math and economics as well as physics.

contingent. Or at least, if they do exist, there is no way for anyone to know them with any accuracy or certainty.³¹

Lonergan's emergent probability is a middle ground that seeks to retain the good of both classical and indeterministic worldviews. Thus, Lonergan does not seek to discover necessary, universal, and unchanging laws relating things with eternally fixed natures. Nor does he abandon the quest for understanding. Rather, Lonergan seeks to discover the intelligible relationships governing the world order as it concretely exists, an order in which new things have various probabilities of emerging.

1.2.2. Classical and Statistical Law

Lonergan acknowledges that there are both systematically intelligible and non-systematically intelligible relationships in the world as it exists concretely. Emergent probability is not a fixed system, but it is not an abandonment of systematic understanding. It is an open, heuristic structure for anticipating a world order that is both intelligible and dynamic. It seeks both "classical" laws (that identify systematic relationships) and "statistical" laws (that look at actual occurrences or events and seek ideal frequencies, or probabilities, from which actual frequencies may diverge but only non-systematically).³² Both classical and statistical laws seek to explain world processes, to be empirically verifiable, and to be practically applicable. For example, in medicine, classical researchers analyze how pulmonary or digestive systems function in general, while statistical researchers determine normative or ideal frequencies at which these

³¹ Ibid., 157-61.

³² Ibid., Chs. 2-4, particularly pp. 126-139.

systems function in actual populations. Doctors use both sets of information to diagnose and treat patients.³³

1.2.3. Schemes of Recurrence: Emergence and Survival

Emergent probability is a generalization and an expansion, or transcendence, of the Darwinian, evolutionary worldview. Darwin focused on probabilities for the emergence and survival of successive species of plants and animals, given various underlying environmental factors. Lonergan's emergent probability considers the probabilities for the emergence and survival of successive things and groups of things, given various underlying other things and groups of things.³⁴ These underlying things and groups of things may be plants or animals, but they need not be. Lonergan tends to refer to them as "operations" and "events." This emphasizes the dynamism of each thing and allows for a more complete account of reality that includes non-physical realities. These operations and events can be grouped into what Lonergan calls "schemes of recurrence" or "recurrent schemes." A recurrent scheme is simply a series or a pattern of interdependent, regularly recurring events, i.e., a cycle. When one event arises, it may lead to another event, which may lead to a third, which may lead to a fourth, which may lead back again to the first, and so on. There may be more or fewer than four events in a recurrent scheme, but what is important is that the events occur, that they are linked interdependently in a circular way, and that they reoccur.

³³ Joseph Flanagan, *Quest for Self-Knowledge: An Essay in Lonergan's Philosophy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 99.

³⁴ *Insight*, 156-57. Another difference, as I see it, is that Darwin gives struggle and competition a more fundamental role than does Lonergan.

Such schemes of recurrence are the common “building blocks” of our universe. They are operative, for example, in the recurrent “perturbed ellipses” of the planets in our solar system, in water’s circulation around the earth, in the nitrogen cycle necessary for earthly life, in animal digestive rhythms, and in human economic cycles of production and consumption.³⁵

The emergence and the survival of various schemes of recurrence do not occur by necessity. Rather, there is a probability for events to emerge and a further probability for these events to group together into emerging schemes that may or may not recur. Many diverse factors need to occur in the right amount and in the right order for the events in any scheme of recurrence to emerge and survive. Given such uncertainties, in some sense, there is an almost miraculous character to much of our world. This said, however, when given very large numbers, distributed across very large areas, over a very long period of time, even events with very low probabilities for emergence and survival are virtually certain to emerge and survive. For example, a scheme of recurrence with a one in a million probability of occurring will occur a million times if given “a million million” simultaneous or successive opportunities for emergence.³⁶

1.2.4. A Dynamic, Interdependent Hierarchy: Transcendence, Sublation, and Vertical Finality

The previous section discussed how in a world governed by emergent probability, things and events are related to each other dynamically and interdependently in various

³⁵ Ibid., 141.

³⁶ Ibid., 146.

schemes of recurrence. In this section, we shall see how schemes of recurrence themselves are related in a dynamic and interdependent way.

Some schemes of recurrence arise earlier than others. Often, earlier schemes set the “conditions of the possibility” for the emergence of later schemes.³⁷ In other words, just as some events are dependent on the prior existence of other events, some recurrent schemes of events are dependent on the existence of other schemes. In the section above, the motion of the planets, of water, of nitrogen, of digestion, and of the human economy represented examples of recurrent schemes of events. The order in which they were presented reveals an order of their dependence. Planetary motions set the conditions for chemical cycles (such as water and nitrogen), which set the condition for biological functions (such as digestion), which set the condition for human economic activities as well as other aspects of human life.

The earlier, more fundamental schemes, Lonergan calls “lower,” and the later schemes that depend on and build on the lower, Lonergan calls “higher.”³⁸ Higher schemes are not merely later but also higher, because in some ways they add qualitatively different relationships, functions, and events not possible on the lower levels. In some ways, these higher schemes encompass and go beyond or “transcend”³⁹ the lower schemes. So, for example, the human schemes of intelligence, affect, and love include “lower” biological and chemical operations but go beyond them.

³⁷ It is important perhaps to note that while Lonergan and Karl Rahner share the use of the phrase “conditions of the possibility,” Rahner tends to use it in the sense of “a priori” or prescinding from the particularities of concrete reality, and Lonergan tends to use it to identify the concrete conditions required for the emergence of particular events or things. For more on the relationship between Rahner and Lonergan, see Otto Muck, *The Transcendental Method*, (Herder and Herder, 1968).

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 148.

³⁹ See footnote 10, above, for a discussion of transcendence as used by Lonergan.

Furthermore, while higher schemes are dependent on lower ones for their emergence and survival, in some ways lower schemes depend on the higher. A higher scheme goes beyond or transcends the lower, and in doing so, the higher lifts up or “sublates” the lower into a new context (the higher scheme), in which the lower scheme is able to find a flourishing and a fulfillment that it could not have attained on its own.⁴⁰

There is, in short, a mutual relationship of dependence between higher and lower schemes of recurrence. The higher schemes would not exist if the lower ones did not first exist. Without material, plant, and animal schemes of recurrence, human schemes of commerce, culture, etc. could not emerge. On the other hand, higher schemes emerge as a more systematic patterning of lower schemes in ways that promote more sophisticated relationships and more fulfilling operations. In animals and plants, chemicals come alive.

At times people may wonder which levels are more important—the higher, more advanced levels, or the lower, more fundamental levels? For Lonergan, they are equally important, but differently so. Consequently, he speaks of the lower as more “essential” and the higher as more “excellent.”⁴¹

These interdependent levels of recurrent schemes, with some schemes higher than others, form a united whole as an interdependent, dynamic hierarchy. Because the schemes in a series are related as progressively ascending, the whole is a hierarchy. Because lower schemes ground the higher ones and the higher schemes order the lower,

⁴⁰ In understanding “sublation,” Lonergan relies to a degree on Hegel. See *Insight*, 446-47.

⁴¹ Bernard Lonergan, “Finality, Love, Marriage,” *Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick Crowe (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 17, 22.

the parts are interdependent. Because there is change or motion both within individual schemes and among groups of schemes, the hierarchy is dynamic.

What all of this means is that the world order of emergent probability is one of a dynamic, interrelated hierarchy of recurrent schemes. The dynamic relations among levels of schemes result primarily from what Lonergan calls “vertical finality.”

“Finality” denotes a thing’s goal, purpose, or end. The scholastic theology of Lonergan’s early education included two notions of finality: “ultimate” or “absolute” and “proportional” or “proximate.” For Christians, God is the ultimate, absolute end of all things in creation.⁴² In other words, the ultimate finality of all created beings is directed toward God. Proportional, proximate finality is the orientation toward a more immediate goal, particularly one proper to a thing’s or a group of things’ inherent capacities or potentialities. For example, an apple tree’s ultimate end is to serve the glory of God, but its proximate end is to produce apples and eventually more apple trees.

Vertical finality introduces a third type of goal, an in-between end. In a world characterized as an interdependent, dynamic hierarchy, a thing’s proportionate/proximate end is called its “horizontal” end. God remains the ultimate, absolute end.⁴³ Between these two, vertical finality indicates that, everything in a horizontal recurrent scheme has ends that are properly fulfilled on a higher-level recurrent scheme. Continuing the

⁴² Following Thomas Aquinas, Lonergan affirms that “man and, as well, all creatures according to their mode naturally love God above all things. And, of course, this love of God above all is only a particular case of the general theorem that absolutely all finality is to God.” Ibid., 25, citing *Summa Theologica*, 1-2, q. 109, a. 3 c.; *Questiones quodlibetales*, 1, a. 8 c. & ad 3m.

⁴³ If one were to imagine the three types of finality as vectors, horizontal finality is well imagined as a horizontal line. Ultimate finality is perhaps best imagined, to the degree possible, as an infinite vertical line. Vertical finality may be imagined as either a short vertical line directed from a lower level to a higher one, or as a short diagonal line directed from a lower level to a higher one, as Lonergan depicts in “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 42.

example above, we might say that the apple tree's vertical finality includes providing sustenance and shelter to birds and other animals (sensitive life-forms) whose proper existence rests on a higher scheme of recurrence. Of course, birds and other higher animal life cycles depend not merely on apples, but on the entire hierarchy of physical, chemical, and biological cycles that make up the earth.

Lonergan's most common example of vertical finality is that of oxygen. Its horizontal, or essential, end is "to perform the offices of oxygen as oxygen, but its more excellent [vertical] end is its contribution to the maintenance of human life and this end attains not in isolation nor *per se* but in combination with other elements and within the human biological process."⁴⁴

Vertical finality is studied not by scholastic philosophy and theology, but by natural science. Abstractly, any thing can be considered in isolation and known to have absolute and horizontal ends, but vertical finality is discovered only by considering the dynamic whole, for "vertical finality seems to operate through the fertility of concrete plurality."⁴⁵ A cosmology that accounts for this "fertility of concrete plurality" does better justice to the actual cosmos than an abstract cosmology. "For the cosmos is not an aggregate of isolated objects hierarchically arranged on isolated levels, but a dynamic whole in which... one level of being or activity subserves another."⁴⁶

Lonergan summarizes emergent probability as "the successive realization in accord with successive schedules of probability of a conditioned series of schemes of

⁴⁴ "Finality, Love, Marriage," 22.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 20.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 21-22.

recurrence.”⁴⁷ The world order it envisions is a dynamic world process, characterized by (1) “successive world situations,” (2) an “initial world situation” valued only for the possibilities it contains and the probabilities for these possibilities’ realization, (3) an openness to new possibilities emerging according to probability (versus determinism and indeterminate change or merely random chance), (4) increasingly systematic relations, (5) the possibility of “enormous differentiation” especially given large numbers, large spaces, and a long time, (6) the possibility of breakdown, since survival is only probable, (7) the possibility of “blind alleys,” or a stunted development, since material that might be used in higher schemes can get bound in earlier schemes, (8) later schemes having narrower distribution, (9) long periods of time being required for less probable later schemes to emerge, (10) larger initial absolute numbers required to offset blind alleys and breakdowns, (11) generic intelligibility, since it anticipates classical and statistical laws but leaves the “determinate content” of particular laws to natural science.⁴⁸

In sum, emergent probability is Lonergan’s cosmology. It is an account of the ordering of the cosmos as a result of the divine wisdom that makes world order prior to individual things. It understands the cosmos as fertile and dynamic, as providing conditions for the possibility of its elements to combine in unpredictable but intelligible ways that are creative⁴⁹ of new levels of interdependent recurrent schemes.

⁴⁷ *Insight*, 148-49.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 149-50.

⁴⁹ From the old, new things arise. From the elements of lower levels, there is an emergence of new sets of intelligible relationships, new wholes drawn from previously non-systematically related elements. But this is not in the strict, theological sense of creation *ex nihilo*, or from nothing. See “Healing and Creating in History,” *A Third Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 102.

1.3. Insight and The Self-Correcting Process of Learning

The previous section considered Lonergan's understanding of the cosmos as a dynamic order governed by emergent probability. Human beings are part of this cosmos. We have emerged from the creative world-process of emergent probability. As a relatively late emergence, humanity is a complex entity subject to the classical and statistical laws on its physical, chemical, biological, and higher levels. While humanity is subject to the laws and ordering of the cosmos, with the advent of humanity arrive two things new to creation: (1) a creature's ability to discover and to work with classical and statistical laws, and thus to guide and to accelerate emergent probability, and (2) the possibility of the rejection of creation's order, i.e., sin. Without humanity, any progress or positive emergence in the world would be more limited (without the acceleration of self-aware guidance). On the other hand, there would be no decline (brought about by sin).⁵⁰ The remainder of this chapter will discuss humanity's unique role in creation and progress, through insight, a broader transcendental method, and a still broader cooperating human community. Sin and decline will be studied in the next chapter.

1.3.1. *Insight into Insight*

In a world organized hierarchically on physical, chemical, and biological levels, humanity adds levels of intelligence,⁵¹ reflectivity, responsibility, civilization, culture, and religion. In Lonergan's view, human intelligence is a basic category applicable in all human endeavors. It gives humanity the unique ability to discover, to guide, and to

⁵⁰ Would there be redemption without humanity? There certainly would not be a redemption from sin.

⁵¹ Lonergan did not write much if anything about animal intelligence and the boundaries between it and human intelligence.

accelerate world processes of emergent probability. Thus, human intelligence is perhaps the main engine for human progress.⁵² At the same time, however, human intelligence is itself a developing entity. We are intelligent in our potential more than in actuality. Consequently, human beings are in the difficult position whereby our intelligence must guide our activity before that intelligence is fully formed.⁵³ Nevertheless, there is a great freedom and responsibility that comes with the use of the human intellect, both for the individual and for society. Through recurrent human schemes of “insight, communication, persuasion, agreement, decision,” the binding significance of underlying planetary, chemical, and biological schemes diminishes.⁵⁴ This is not to say, however, that these underlying schemes are ever completely transcended.

If human intelligence is fundamental to human development, and if there is indeed a way in which intelligence itself must develop, then how does it develop? How does it function? And how can we best harness it for the good of human society? Lonergan’s largest and perhaps most famous work, *Insight, A Study of Human Understanding*, is—as its title indicates—a study of human insight, the primary product of human intelligence. Its purpose, as Lonergan explains in its preface and introduction, is “to thoroughly understand what it is to understand,” to gain “insight into insight.”⁵⁵ Highly abstract and theoretical, *Insight* is not merely an abstract, theoretical work. Its ultimate aim is pedagogical and practical. It is pedagogical because “the aim is not to set

⁵² This is true for Lonergan in *Insight. Method in Theology*, published almost fifteen years after *Insight*, gives a broader picture of human progress that includes the human response to value, the exercise of freedom, and the effects of love, as we shall see in section 1.4.

⁵³ *Insight*, 711; “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 24.

⁵⁴ *Insight*, 236.

⁵⁵ *Insight*, 22, 8.

forth a list of the abstract properties of human knowledge but to assist the reader in effecting a personal appropriation of the concrete dynamic structure immanent and recurrently operative in his [or her] own cognitional activities.”⁵⁶ A personal grasp of one’s “own cognitional activities” is practical, because these activities produce the understanding or misunderstanding that results in progress or decline. By heightening one’s awareness of the processes that *can* generate insight and thus progress, one increases the likelihood of *successfully* generating insight and progress.⁵⁷ Insight is so central to progress that Lonergan states, “insight into insight brings to light the cumulative process of progress.”⁵⁸ So just what is insight? What does it mean to understand?

Insight, or at least the cognitive process of coming to insight, begins with the conscious desire to understand. Human beings are not, however, always conscious. Lonergan contrasts human “consciousness” or “subjectivity” with human “nature” or “substance.” Fundamentally and at all times, the human person is substance, or an instance of being. When one lies in a dreamless sleep, one is alive, but barely conscious, and thus not fully a subject as Lonergan defines it.

The beginnings human subjectivity come in conscious dreams. Then, upon waking, our consciousness leaps to a new level. Even on waking one is not immediately intelligent, Lonergan says. It is only gradually that one comes first to a basic, sensitive awareness of her/his surroundings. With this sensitive awareness, one may seek

⁵⁶ Ibid., 12.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 6.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 8.

intelligible patterns in the environment. If this environment is familiar, one will recognize it as normal, as understandable. But if it is unfamiliar, even in just a single element, one will spontaneously wonder: What is that? Before a person figures out what the unfamiliar element actually is, how it got there, why it got there, what it has to do with everything else, the person will feel tense due to a deep and spontaneous desire to understand his or her situation.

This desire to understand is not limited to intellectuals or geniuses. It is not a culturally conditioned characteristic. Rather, it is a normal, natural aspect of human personhood and of the subject as conscious.⁵⁹ This natural desire to understand is absolutely fundamental to Lonergan's philosophy and theology. He does not attempt to prove it but rather invites his reader to attend to her/his own interiority and verify this yearning within him or herself.⁶⁰

Insight is the proper fulfillment of this basic human desire. It is what wonder seeks. The arrival of insight releases the tension that accompanies the desire to know. Insight, or understanding, is the *patterning* or *relating* of distinct elements into an intelligible whole. It is a central part of how human persons come to know and to do just about anything. For example, to understand this text, or any text, one cannot rely merely on seeing the text or running one's eyes over the page. Taking a good look does not—by itself—bring knowledge. A further step needs to be made. This step is taken not by the senses but by the mind. Human intelligence relates lines into letters, letters into words,

⁵⁹ "Existenz and Aggiornamento," 241; *Insight*, 372-74.

⁶⁰ The entire book, *Insight*, is an invitation to this personal exploration. Lonergan reveals his pedagogical method in the introduction (pp., 11-24).

words into sentences. One understands the meaning of letters, words, and sentences through one's mind and not just with one's eyes. Knowing begins with experience (either sense experience or the experience of one's interiority or inner experience⁶¹), but it is realized only in the further operations of authentic questioning, understanding, and judging.⁶²

To portray dramatically the characteristics of insight, Lonergan tells the famous story of Archimedes leaping naked out of the Syracuse baths to run around yelling, "Eureka!" King Hiero had charged Archimedes with discovering whether a crown was pure gold. Archimedes puzzled intently over the question until the answer struck him as he was entering the baths. The story brings to light five characteristics of insight. In the first place, insight

comes as a release to the tension of inquiry.... Deep within us all, emergent when the noise of other appetites is stilled, there is a drive to know, to understand, to see why, to discover the reason, to find the cause, to explain. ... It [inquiry, the desire to know] can fill his [or her] waking thoughts, hide from him the world of ordinary affairs, invade the very fabric of his dreams. It can demand endless sacrifices that are made without regret though there is only the hope, never a promise of success. What better symbol could one find for this obscure, exigent imperious drive, than a man, naked, running excitedly crying, "I've got it"?⁶³

Secondly, insight comes suddenly, unexpectedly, "Archimedes' insight did not occur while he was in the mood and posture that a sculptor would select to portray "The Thinker." It came to him in a flash, on a trivial occasion, in a moment of relaxation."⁶⁴

Insight is reached

⁶¹ Lonergan discusses both the data of sense and the data of consciousness (*Insight*, 95-97, 206-7, 260-61, 299-300).

⁶² To be discussed in section 1.4. of this chapter.

⁶³ *Insight*, 28-29.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 29.

in the last analysis, not by learning rules, not by following precepts, not by studying any methodology. Discovery is a new beginning. It is the origin of new rules that supplement or even supplant the old. Genius is creative. It is genius precisely because it disregards established routines, because it originates the novelties that will be the routines of the future.⁶⁵

Third, insight is a function more of inner conditions than of outer circumstances. Insight is not the product of mere sensation. Many people can share an experience, but each can come to different interpretations of the experience depending on their intelligence, attentiveness, and inquisitiveness. Many people shared the baths with Archimedes, but only he had the question.

Fourth, insight “pivots” between the concrete/particular and the abstract/universal. Insights arise in particular, concrete situations, as possible solutions to particular problems, but they tend to have “a significance greater than their origins and a relevance wider than their original applications.”⁶⁶ One needs concrete images and other data from the senses to get insight, but insight is best expressed in the abstract language such as that of math and science. So Archimedes’ insight provided a concrete solution to a concrete problem, but it has general implications that can only be expressed in “the abstract formulations of the principles of displacement and specific gravity.”⁶⁷

Fifth, though an insight is initially surprising, it becomes rudimentary. Before one solves a problem, the problem is difficult. “But once one has understood, one has crossed a divide. What a moment ago was an insolvable problem now becomes incredibly simple and obvious. Moreover, it tends to remain simple and obvious.”⁶⁸ Once Archimedes had

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 30.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

his insight, he could explain it readily to the king. A similar process happens in diverse areas of human inquiry.

1.3.2. Insight and Progress: Common Sense and Science

Such is insight, but how does insight drive progress? Early in the book *Insight*, Lonergan answers briefly and compactly:

[C]oncrete situations give rise to insights which issue into policies and courses of action. Action transforms the situation to give rise to further insights, better policies, more effective courses of action. It follows that if insight occurs, it keeps recurring; and at each recurrence knowledge develops, action increases its scope, and situations improve.⁶⁹

“Concrete situations,” are the real, everyday events and occasions any person, anywhere, at any time might encounter. Concrete situations give rise to questions, concerns, problems, and opportunities. Each person encounters unique situations in unique ways, but there is some overlap.⁷⁰ In the task of everyday living, all people wonder: What’s going on? What should I do? How I should live? How can we make things better? Everyone comes to some ideas or insights about how to live, and we all act on those ideas. Our ideas and our actions change the situations. New situations cause us to wonder anew: What’s going on? What should I do? How should I live? How can we make things better?

The process by which living gives rise to questions, questions lead to answers, answers lead to new ways of living, and new ways of living lead to new questions, and so forth, Lonergan calls the “self-correcting process of learning.”⁷¹ This process works in

⁶⁹ Ibid., 8.

⁷⁰ “[O]ur separate, unrevealed, hidden cores have a common circle of reference, the human community, and an ultimate point of reference, which is God, who is all in all” (“Existenz and Aggiornamento,” 240, “Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious,” 314).

⁷¹ “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” 174; *Insight*, 197-98, 311-12, 314-16, 325, 328-29, 370, 729)

all fields, no matter what a person may do—from farming and construction to baseball and rap to brain surgery and rocket science. Thus, Lonergan affirms that “one meets intelligence in every walk of life.”⁷² The pursuit and the implementation of insight are fundamental to human endeavors, because they are essential to human nature. In support of this, Lonergan affirms that the “light and drive of intelligent inquiry” may be most visible in little children, particularly in their “secret wonder that, once the mystery of language has been unraveled, rushes forth in a cascade of questions.... The child would understand everything at once.”⁷³

This self-correcting process of learning, with insight at its core, occurs on a communal level as well. Human living is communal living. Through communal experimentation, discussion, and collaboration, ideas are tested and refined. Society is not static but an ongoing project spanning generations. The social self-correcting process of learning produces “a common fund of tested answers.” Though it may be the product of thousands of years and millions of people, this fund remains ever incomplete and thus ever subject to the self-correcting process of learning. In other words, on a social scale, the natural human tendency toward spontaneous questioning, answering, testing, and collaborating leads to a “public store” or “common fund” that Lonergan calls “common sense.”⁷⁴

Common sense is common, but it is not general in the way math or science is common. Algebra and chemistry, for example, are not bound to a local community and

⁷² *Insight*, 196

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 196-97.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 197-98. Common Sense is the main topic of chs. 6 and 7.

local culture to the degree that common sense is. This is not so much a flaw of common sense, but an aspect of its purpose. Common sense specializes in answering particular and practical questions that people face in their everyday, concrete living. Though particular situations are never exactly the same, there is a great degree of commonality in the daily routines followed by people living within a given natural or social environment. Different groups distinguished by location, or even by occupation and other social arrangements, will each have distinct versions of common sense.⁷⁵ Individuals who operate in multiple communities will have to master multiple common senses, such as those found at home, in the workplace, at church, and in the nation.

A common sense is simply a common fund of insights, a general storehouse of tools developed over time by a community. To make a standing, common fund relevant and applicable to a new, particular problem, one normally will need to add at least one new insight into the current situation.⁷⁶ This is true because each concrete situation will have some conditions similar to other situations encountered by the community, but it will also have some conditions that are unique.

Due to this combination of similarity and uniqueness, or the general and the particular, common sense works through hints and pointers more than by necessary rules. Its tools are proverbs and stories rather than scientific theories. As a common fund, common sense is not the same as the communal discourses of academic research. It does not aspire to the systemization or the universality of science. Its language is not technical

⁷⁵ Ibid., 203.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

or formal. “As the proverb has it, a wink is as good as a nod.”⁷⁷ To convey meaning, common sense uses the imprecise but effective expressions of body language, gesture, pause, tone, and volume. Common sense is tremendously resourceful in dealing with the vast and varied exigencies of human communication, which often is not simply the communication of concepts but a *self*-communication. For such a task, common sense must be adaptable to situation and audience: “For common sense not merely says what it means; it says it to someone; it begins by exploring the other fellow’s intelligence; it advances by determining what further insights have to be communicated to him [or her]; it undertakes the communication, not as an exercise in formal logic, but as a work of art...”⁷⁸

Common sense is logical in the sense of “intelligent and reasonable,” but its logic is not formal and scientific in the sense of conforming to “a set of general rules valid in every instance of a defined range.”⁷⁹ Science, as defined by Lonergan, seeks to understand things as they exist in relation *to each other*, while common sense is content to know things as they are related *to us* or *to oneself*. Thus, for example, common sense describes the weather as “hot” or “cold,” and science explains the weather by measuring one temperature in relation to other temperatures, such as 28° or 98° Fahrenheit.

Another aspect of the common-sense focus on things as they are related to oneself is a single-minded concern for the practical application or “usefulness” of knowledge. This is perhaps the most significant difference between common sense and science. A

⁷⁷ Ibid., 200.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 201.

scientist may very well be interested in the technological application of his or her research, but s/he may also be motivated by a “pure desire to know” a desire for knowledge for its own sake rather than for its usefulness.⁸⁰ Common sense, on the other hand, is “bounded by the interests and concerns of human living, by the successful performance of daily tasks, by the discovery of immediate solutions that will work. Indeed, the supreme canon of common sense is the restriction of further questions to the realm of the concrete and particular, the immediate and the practical.”⁸¹

This focus on the concrete, particular, immediate, and practical is the strength of common sense—all people, including scientists, philosophers, and mystics, use common sense to navigate their daily lives. However, this focus is also its weakness. Lonergan emphasizes that common sense is an indispensable aspect of knowing, but he also stresses that it is not the only aspect of knowing. There is more to life than what is immediately practical. If one over-emphasizes the role of common sense, one will behave like a ten year old in math class, asking: Who cares? What difference does that make? “[A]nd if the answer is less vivid and less rapid than an advertisement,” a person bound by common sense will not care about it. There are many practical applications to math, science, history, philosophy, and other academic disciplines, but these are longer-term developments not quickly recognized by common sense.⁸² Lonergan dramatizes the

⁸⁰ See *Insight*, 372-74, and Bernard Lonergan, “Openness and Religious Experience,” *Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 198.

⁸¹ *Insight*, 201.

⁸² More on the relation of common sense to other forms of knowing will follow in section 1.5.5. of this chapter.

tendency of common sense to restrict one's interest to the immediately practical:

“Rockets and space platforms are superfluous if you intend to remain on this earth.”⁸³

1.3.3. Common Sense, Sensitivity and Spontaneous Intersubjectivity

As a public fund of traditional insights into a community's daily concerns, common sense is indispensable for human progress. Common sense intends to stay “on this earth,” because that is its role—it specializes in serving the community's everyday needs and desires. On a basic level there are needs for particular goods—goods needed not once and for all but repeatedly and regularly. In addition to such frequency, we desire not only the familiar but also the novel. Moreover, not even a steady flow of novel and familiar goods will keep us satisfied, for the human person spontaneously and naturally desires to craft a dignified living, to become the kind of person s/he can be happy with and proud of. Such a craft is complicated, for on multiples levels, each person has individual “needs and wants, pleasures and pains, labor and leisure, enjoyment and privation.”⁸⁴ Finally, there is a natural human need and desire for community, for falling in love.

As discussed in the previous section, common sense is a common fund that grows from the self-correcting process of learning, i.e., social situations lead to questions, questions lead to insights, and insights transform the social situation. A significant element of the social situation is the community's needs and desires. Thus, common sense develops in relation to a community's needs and desires. It is not merely the servant of these needs and desires; it exists in a creative tension with them.

⁸³ *Insight*, 202.

⁸⁴ *Insight*, 237.

Although insight is a significant component of human progress, human beings are not simply cool and rational. There is more to our decisions than a self-correcting process of learning. Both individually and socially people tend to make decisions spontaneously. We typically identify the good not with an answer to a question but with some immediate object of desire.⁸⁵

Lonergan locates the source of such desire as well as other spontaneous feelings in what he calls “sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity.”⁸⁶ They form a kind of pre-critical, pre-reflective level of human living. They are natural and personal, but they are not simply natural or purely individualistic, neither “animal impulse” nor “egoistic scheming.”⁸⁷

To some degree the individual’s spontaneous desires, feelings, and preferences are natural, but to some degree they are habituated by society. As with common sense and science, the relation between common sense and “sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity” is not one of competition but of cooperation. Common sense seeks ways to fulfill spontaneous needs and desires, but it must also arbitrate between competing needs and desires. In serving and arbitrating a community’s needs and desires, common sense works with natural human needs and desires and it forms a community’s aesthetic taste, food preferences, physical habits, daily routines, and more. So, for example, the members of one culture may prefer spicy food, afternoon naps, and

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 237-239, 723. Lonergan recognizes multiple kinds of feelings as we shall see in section 1.4.1.3 of this chapter.

⁸⁷ *Insight*, 711.

late workdays, while another will prefer salty food, no naps, and an early end to the workday.

Not only are our needs and desires not purely natural, they are not entirely individualistic or egotistical. Rather, Lonergan affirms, there is a spontaneous intersubjectivity that binds persons in community:

Prior to the “we” that results from the mutual love of an “I” and a “thou,” there is the earlier “we” that precedes the distinction of subjects and survives its oblivion. This prior “we” is vital and functional. Just as one spontaneously raises one’s arm to ward off a blow against one’s head, so with the same spontaneity one reaches out to save another from falling. Perception, feeling, and bodily movement are involved, but the help given another is not deliberate but spontaneous. One adverts to it not before it occurs but while it is occurring. It is as if “we” were members of one another prior to our distinctions of each from the others.⁸⁸

The spontaneous, intersubjective bonds are most clear in the family, but they also provide the basis for civilization, and they remain even when a civilization assigns other, non-spontaneous social relationships (such as formal relations between teacher and student).

Although they can reinforce cultivated social bonds and common sense, sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity may be in tension with common sense reasoning. For example, after years of scientific research, health campaigns, and shifting public opinion, a person may know that regular exercise is good and want to do it, but s/he could spontaneously avoid it. In addition to natural spontaneous desires, there are learned habits and desires that become spontaneous. So common sense can tell one that smoking is bad, but one may still crave a cigarette. Such oppositions between what a person or a society knows to be good and what is spontaneously desired is

⁸⁸ *Method*, 57. One may recognize the language of Martin Buber. See also, *Insight*, 237 and “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 24.

problematic, because human beings are naturally inclined to act in harmony with both spontaneous desires and common sense insight.⁸⁹

On a social level there might form subgroups with desires, feelings, and ideas that are more or less in harmony with the good of the whole society. In the ideal situation society maintains harmony among various subgroups by peaceful means:

It commands their esteem by its palpable benefits; it has explained its intricate demands in some approximate yet sufficient fashion; it has adapted to its own requirements the play of imagination, the resonance of sentiment, the strength of habit, the ease of familiarity, the impetus of enthusiasm, the power of agreement and consent. Then a man's interest is in happy coincidence with his work; his country is also his homeland; its ways are the obviously right ways; its glory and peril are his own.⁹⁰

Even in this ideal situation of harmony between the individual and the group, the group and the larger society, common sense will still remain in a kind of creative tension or “dialectic” with sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity. Lonergan defines dialectic as “a concrete unfolding of linked but opposed principles of change.”⁹¹ In this case, common sense⁹² and sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity are the main principles of social progress. They are “linked” because common sense is an effort of human intelligence to order things practically, and intersubjective desires and fears form the basis of what common sense orders. They are “opposed” because as common sense advances in insight and in the technological, economic, and political ways of organizing a society, its member's sensitivities and spontaneous intersubjectivities either lag behind in

⁸⁹ Ibid., 241.

⁹⁰ Ibid. The opposition of groups within society is discussed at greater length in the next chapter, as “group bias.”

⁹¹ Ibid., 242.

⁹² Here Lonergan speaks of common sense in a broad sense that includes the applied or practical aspects of natural and human sciences, such as technology, economics, and politics (Ibid., 242-43).

habituation, or they speeds ahead with desires and fears that common sense cannot yet meet.⁹³

Although a dialectical relationship between common sense and sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity drives progress, it can also result in problems and even decline. Decline is the subject of our next chapter, but let us consider how a problem might arise out of this dialectic. In a given situation desires and fears arise from sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity. These desires and fears call for changes in the situation. Common sense seeks new insights into the situation and figures out what to do. Acting on these insights transforms the situation, and once the situation is altered, it calls again for further adaptations to human spontaneity and sensibility and for new desires and fears. For example, the need for food led to technological changes in food production. For parts of the world, this has resulted in increased food production and decreased physical labor. A negative aspect of such progress is the rising rate of obesity in societies where common-sense standards of self-moderation and spontaneous cravings have not yet adapted to the new bounty.

The adaptation of sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity requires a long and laborious process of discovery, teaching, learning, writing, reading, and persuasion. “So it is that the present is ever a pattern of lags. No one can postpone his [or her] living until he has learnt, until he has become willing, until his sensitivity has become adapted.”⁹⁴ In

⁹³ The demand for sport-utility vehicles (SUVs) provides a contemporary example. When gas prices were low and environmental concerns were not widespread, SUVs became popular. But with rising gas prices and global warming becoming accepted as fact, demand is falling. Some members of society lag behind the shift, continuing to spontaneously desire an SUV, while others speed ahead, demanding imperfect hybrid cars.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 711.

other words, human beings must live before they have learned to live. Providentially, we have other resources built into emergent probability beyond common-sense insight and beyond the desires and fears of sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity. There is more to human progress than insight and its creative tension with sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity.

1.4. Transcendental Method: The Larger Picture of Self-Transcendence

As we learned from the cosmological context of Lonergan's anthropology, the world is ordered as a dynamic, interdependent hierarchy. Lower levels of recurrent schemes set the conditions for the more or less probable emergence and survival of higher recurrent schemes. Higher levels depend on the lower levels, but they also transcend, or go beyond them. And they do so in a way that sublates the lower ones, or lifts them up into a greater, richer context that preserves and fulfills them. Lower levels are more essential to the whole, and higher levels are more excellent.

Humanity is a later and higher emergence in the cosmos. It transcends and sublates material, chemical, and biological recurrent schemes into a larger psychological context. We have considered insight and its role in the community's and the world's development, but insight is not the entire human contribution to emergent probability. The human person is complex. Not only are we comprised of material, chemical, biological, and psychological levels, but on the psychological level there is a multiplicity to the human person.

Thus far, we have seen how on the lower, more essential of the psychological levels, the human person has spontaneous needs, desires, and fears. We have seen how

on a higher intellectual level, one seeks to order those spontaneities in ways consistent with communal needs and common sense. Finally, we have seen that these two levels exist in a creative, dialectical tension that can produce both progress and decline. This is a rich picture, but it is not the full picture.

1.4.1. Four Levels of Conscious Intentionality

Published fifteen years after *Insight*, *Method in Theology* extends Lonergan's coverage of cognitive theory, epistemology, and metaphysics⁹⁵ into the realms of ethics, or decision-making in a social context, and religion, or relationship with the absolutely transcendent.⁹⁶ To *Insight's* account of the human person as sensitive, spontaneously interpersonal, and intellectual, *Method* adds a more developed consideration of the person as concerned with value, exercising freedom, and falling in love.

The core of *Method's* anthropology is an analysis of human psychology or "conscious intentionality" according to four levels. In each of the four levels, a person is *conscious* in the sense of being self-aware or self-present⁹⁷ and *intentional* in the sense of seeking a goal.⁹⁸ The four levels are: (1) empirical, (2) intelligent, (3) rational,⁹⁹ and (4) responsible. Accordingly, each level is designated by one crucial kind of operation, namely experience, understanding, judgment, and decision. Furthermore, each of these

⁹⁵ Studies that answer, respectively: "What am I doing when I am knowing? Why is that knowing? What do I know when I do it?" *Method*, 25.

⁹⁶ *Insight* ends with relatively brief yet still very fruitful discussions on the "possibility" of ethics, and a general notion of and heuristic for transcendental, religious knowledge; see chs. 18-20.

⁹⁷ More will be said on this in section 1.4.1.1., below. See also sections 1.1. and 1.3.1., above.

⁹⁸ See *Method*, 7-8. The goals of each level will be discussed below.

⁹⁹ Lonergan distinguishes between reason/rationality and logic. Reason is a broader term. It can be both logical and non-logical. "The logical tend to consolidate what has been achieved. The non-logical keep all achievement open to further advance. The conjunction of the two results in an open, ongoing, progressive and cumulative process" (Ibid., 6). Logic operates on propositions, providing control and coherence. Reason facilitates discovery by an advertence to experience. It judges ideas based on both empirical evidence and logical coherence with known truths. More will be said in the following sections.

overarching operations, or levels, is comprised of multiple sub-operations. Lonergan summarizes:

There is the *empirical* level on which we sense, perceive, imagine, feel, speak, move. There is an *intelligent* level on which we inquire, come to understand, express what we have understood, work out the presuppositions and implications of our expression. There is a *rational* level on which we reflect, marshal the evidence, pass judgment about the truth or falsity, certainty or probability, of a statement. There is a *responsible* level on which we are concerned with ourselves, our own operations, our goals, and so deliberate about possible courses of action, evaluate them, decide, and carry out our decisions.¹⁰⁰

The operations relate to each other as levels generally do in a world of emergent probability: by transcendence and sublation.¹⁰¹ Responsible decisions presuppose and go beyond rational judgments about reality. Rational judgments presuppose and go beyond intelligent understanding. Understanding builds on experience. Lonergan uses the term “levels” because a person’s movement from one operation to another expands his/her consciousness. Movement from one level to another constitutes personal growth and ultimately social progress. As in the self-correcting process of learning, experience, understanding, judgment, and decision both emerges from and transforms the concrete, social situation.

The four levels do not constitute a rigid set of rules.¹⁰² Lonergan’s term for the four levels as a whole is “method,” which he defines as “a normative pattern of recurrent and related operations yielding cumulative and progressive results.”¹⁰³ Lonergan affirms

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 9.

¹⁰¹ Higher levels presuppose and build upon the lower. The higher include but go beyond the lower, and the higher lift the lower to a greater context that fulfills the potential of the lower in ways the lower could not achieve on its own. The “normal” movement is from the lowest level to the highest, but there are two exceptions to this general rule, by which the movement is from the higher levels down to the lower. And while they are the exception, they actually form the larger context for the movement from below upwards, since much of what we know we do not first experience, we believe. *Method*, 123-24, 41-47.

¹⁰² Ibid., 6

¹⁰³ *Method*, 4.

that experience, understanding, judgment, and decision are operations performed by people of all walks of life throughout their daily lives.¹⁰⁴ The operations are used in every human enterprise, from playing soccer to debating metaphysics.¹⁰⁵ The method is a kind of “third way” between art and science and fundamental to both.¹⁰⁶ Because the method is (1) used in all fields, (2) comprised of operations that include and go beyond each other, and (3) the means of personal growth and social progress, Lonergan calls it a “transcendental method.”

Let us examine the operations of this transcendental method in greater detail.

1.4.1.1. Experience

Lonergan’s use of the term “experience” differs in two ways from contemporary usage. First, in everyday language, one might call someone “a person of experience” and mean that s/he has encountered a wide variety of situations and events, successes and failures, and thus has a great deal of “first-hand knowledge” as opposed to “mere book-smarts.” Lonergan’s use of experience is narrower than this. For Lonergan, experience is much more basic. It does not necessarily lead to knowledge, but it can be a first step. Two people can have the same experience and not come to the same conclusions. For example, a two year old and a twenty-two year old watching a movie share an experience. But they will learn very different things from the movie. Experience for Lonergan does not yield knowledge but data.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 3-4. Lonergan does not attempt to prove this method. Rather, he invites us in *Method* (14-21), as he did in *Insight*, to attend to our own consciousnesses and verify, augment, modify, or seek to deny his account.

¹⁰⁵ Religion and theology, however, are more than human achievements. This method, thus, provides the “basic anthropological component” but not the “specifically religious component” (*Method*, 25).

¹⁰⁶ *Method*, 4.

While in this way Lonergan's use of the word "experience" is narrower than contemporary usage, Lonergan's is in some ways broader. We tend to think of experience as the product of the physical senses—one experiences what one sees, hears, tastes, smells, or touches. This is experience for Lonergan, but Lonergan would broaden the term from simply the realm of sense data to include what he calls the "data of consciousness." Consciousness, for Lonergan is the self-awareness or self-presence that occurs to some degree in dreams but more completely when one awakens. The data of consciousness is what one gains when attending to one's own conscious operations of desiring, fearing, questioning, understanding, judging, deliberating, deciding, loving, etc.

For Lonergan, thus, experience is two-fold. There is the presence of physical objects through the data of our physical senses. Then there is the larger, more basic self-presence gained in the data of consciousness. Neither in itself is knowledge, but both may constitute a beginning of knowledge.

1.4.1.2. Understanding

A person's experience gives rise to questions. By our nature we wonder. We desire to understand. We want to know. The human experience is the source of a potentially endless number of questions; however, Lonergan asserts that all questions can be divided into two main types: *Quid sit?* (What is it?) and *An sit?* (Is it so?)¹⁰⁷ The first is a question for intelligence. It aims at insight, at understanding intelligible relationships, or, more traditionally, at the grasp of essences. The second question is for

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 335. Lonergan follows Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas in distinguishing the two. Cf., *Insight*, Ch. 9.

reflection, for rational judgment. It rests not in insight, intelligible relationships, or essences, but in reality, the facts, or existence.

This is not to say that understanding and judgment are opposed. However, the distinction between understanding and judgment or between “What is it?” and “Is it so?” is crucial for Lonergan. The difference is similar to that between “hypothesis” and “conclusion” in modern scientific method.¹⁰⁸ The former is a more or less interesting *idea* and the latter is (ideally) the knowledge of *truth*.

Thus, as with experience, Lonergan uses the term, “understanding,” in a specific, technical sense that differs from the typical meaning. In the common usage, when one says, “I understand,” one means, “I get it. I know what you mean. I know what’s going on.” It could also express sympathy, indicating that one feels somewhat how the other feels. By “understanding” Lonergan means neither knowing nor sympathizing.

We have distinguished Lonergan’s use of understanding from both the common meaning of the term and his own use of the term, “judgment.” But what does Lonergan mean by “understanding”? Simply put, understanding is insight as well as the operation that grasps an insight. Insight, as we have discussed in section 1.3.1, is the patterning or relating of multiple things (shapes, colors, words, events, etc.) into an intelligible whole. One understands *what* a thing is by grasping the relationships of the thing’s parts as well as the relationships of the thing to other things. Complete understanding, of course, is had by understanding all things in all of their relationships, and such understanding is

¹⁰⁸ *Method*, 5.

enjoyed by God alone.¹⁰⁹ The absence of complete understanding does not, however, preclude the possibility of any understanding.

1.4.1.3. Judgment: Fact and Value

Knowledge, according to Lonergan, comes not in understanding, but in judgment. Again, Lonergan uses the term in a particular, technical sense. For Lonergan, knowledge is not a product of experience alone, of understanding alone, or of experience and understanding combined. Rather, knowledge is a composite of experience, understanding, *and* the further step called judgment.

Lonergan's distinction between understanding and judgment may seem abstract and unhelpful. But philosophers and thinkers influenced by philosophy, including theologians, spend much time and energy debating the nature of reality and how it can be known. There are perhaps two dominant schools, materialists/empiricists (who believe reality physical and is known through the senses) and idealists (who believe the physical world is deceptive appearance and the real world of unchanging ideas is known by reason or intuition).¹¹⁰

Lonergan acknowledges the important roles of both experience and understanding while avoiding the temptations to totalize the significance of either. Experience provides the data (of sense and consciousness). Understanding takes the data and uses questions to come up with ideas or insights. Insights, however are "a dime a dozen."¹¹¹

Understanding attains only *possible* intelligible relationships, while only judgment

¹⁰⁹ See *Insight*, Ch. 19.

¹¹⁰ *Method*, 213-14.

¹¹¹ *Method*, 13.

apprehends *actual* intelligible relationships, the facts, or the truth. Insights are important, but they are simply ideas, and our ideas are often wrong. There are many possible ways of understanding one's experience, but reality is one. To know the facts about reality, a person must correctly judge the correctness of his/her understanding of experience.¹¹²

This process reflects the drama that plays out in courts of law. The *witnesses* provide the experiential data. *Lawyers* present different understandings or interpretations of the data. The *jury* or *judge* attempts to judge impartially which lawyer's interpretation is closest to the truth. Lawyers ask multiple questions of their witnesses, but there is only one question asked of the jury: Is the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?¹¹³

Clearly, if judgment is the way people come to know reality in all areas of human living, it is very important to determine the standards for making correct, reasonable, or impartial judgments. If experience and intelligence alone are not reliable standards for objectivity, then what is? Instinct? Imagination? Gut feelings? An external authority (such as scientific experts, the wisdom of the ages, tradition, scripture, and revelation)? Lonergan affirms that these are invaluable for human living,¹¹⁴ however, the problem with these and other sources is that they too must be experienced, understood, and judged by a human person—if they are to be known by that person. Thus, Lonergan's standard for making a correct judgment is not some element of human subjectivity or some

¹¹² Ibid., 230-33. Lonergan acknowledges that while reality is one, people's understanding and judgment of reality is multiple. Many will be correct but incomplete. Then there is the possibility of error and bias. Lonergan asserts that error and bias are not necessary consequences of human subjectivity but failures and aberrations. Thus, Lonergan takes a position against extreme forms of deconstruction, hermeneutics of suspicion, relativism, etc. Chapters 10 and 11 of *Method* ("Dialectic" and "Foundations") provide tools for identifying the causes of differences and promoting authentic agreement. We will discuss bias in section 2.2. of this chapter.

¹¹³ There is, of course, a fourth step: the *judge* has the responsibility to decide what to do based on the jury's verdict. This will be discussed in the next section,

¹¹⁴ The importance of belief for Lonergan follows in section 1.5.3. of this chapter.

external authority. Rather it is the whole person, what he calls “the authentic subject.”

As Lonergan writes, “Genuine objectivity is the fruit of authentic subjectivity.”¹¹⁵

Authenticity is our topic for a future section (1.4.2), however, let us consider now the basic question: How does one make a judgment?

Judgment presupposes and builds upon experience and understanding. Just as wonder or questioning provides the transition from experience to understanding, so a question raises one’s consciousness from understanding to the level of judgment. The question that provides this transition is, *Is it so? or Is it true?* When a person comes to some idea about her/his experience, s/he would fittingly begin to wonder whether or not his/her idea or insight is correct. Lonergan calls this the question for “reflection” or “critical reflection.”¹¹⁶ To answer this question, a person must “marshal the evidence”¹¹⁷ or gather the empirical data involved in the situation. Then s/he must compare the data to his/her insight or hypothesis. Does the data support the hypothesis? If the evidence or data is deemed “sufficient” for supporting the insight or hypothesis, then a person makes a judgment of fact about the insight.¹¹⁸

If the sufficiency of evidence grounds judgment of fact, then what determines sufficiency? There are two factors involved: (1) the verification of empirical conditions for the existence of a thing, and (2) the absence of “further pertinent questions” that might challenge the truth of an insight.¹¹⁹ For the first, Lonergan makes a distinction between the “formally unconditioned” and the “virtually unconditioned.” The formally

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 292. more on judgment and objectivity, see *Insight*, Ch. 10.

¹¹⁶ *Insight*, 295-301; *Method*, 9-11.

¹¹⁷ *Method*, 9.

¹¹⁸ *Insight*, 304-05.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 309, 661-62, 105-6, 296-99. Cf., *Method*, 35.

unconditioned exists with no conditions, period. Only God exists as formally unconditioned. Creation as a whole and any part of creation exists as virtually unconditioned. There are conditions for its existence, but when the conditions necessary for its existence are fulfilled, it is called “virtually unconditioned.”¹²⁰ When a person knows the conditions for the existence of something and can verify the conditions for its existence, then the person can know or judge for a fact that the thing exists. To take a simple example, if I know that the conditions to judge a TV as working are that the TV turns on and that it receives and communicates images and sounds from a broadcast station, and if I have indeed verified that the TV turns on and is receiving and broadcasting images and sounds, I know that the TV works.

The second factor, the absence of further pertinent questions illustrates the subjective aspect in authentic judgment. It also illustrates Lonergan’s trust in the natural, human unrestricted desire to know. Wonder, for Lonergan is an immanent standard for knowing the truth. He believes that if a person does not have sufficient evidence for judging his/her idea as true, then s/he will reserve judgment, ideally. If further pertinent questions arise, then the person will know that the evidence is not sufficient.¹²¹ There are many subjective conditions for a sufficient amount of pertinent questions to arise. A person, by temperament, may be “rash” or “indecisive.”¹²² He or she may not have the prior experience, understanding, and judgments necessary for further questions to arise, and/or s/he may simply not have enough time to allow them to emerge. Despite this

¹²⁰ Ibid., 305; *Method*, 75-76.

¹²¹ *Insight*, 308-09.

¹²² Ibid., 312.

fragility of judgments, people make concrete judgments and live their lives by them all the time. One can increase the probability of correct judgments “by intellectual alertness, by taking one’s time, by talking things over, by putting viewpoints to the test of action.”¹²³ There are difficulties in making judgments of truth, however; Lonergan maintains the possibility of correct judgments from the fact that we make several of them, large and small throughout our daily lives.

When one has correctly made a judgment and reached knowledge of an aspect of created reality or of the virtually unconditioned, one has completed what Lonergan calls “intellectual self-transcendence.” The process begins in experience; it makes qualitative leaps in questions for intelligence, insights, and questions for reflection; however, one attains a complete stage of intellectual or “cognitive” self-transcendence only in the judgment of fact or truth. “For a judgment that this or that is so reports, not what appears to me, not what I imagine, not what I think, not what I wish, not what I would be inclined to say, not what seems to me, but what is so.”¹²⁴

Though judgment of fact is the fullness of intellectual self-transcendence, it is not the fullness of human self-transcendence as a whole, for human living does not consist merely in understanding and knowing but also in valuing and doing.¹²⁵ Building on and going beyond intellectual self-transcendence is “moral self-transcendence.”¹²⁶ The

¹²³ Ibid., 310.

¹²⁴ *Method*, 104-05. This quote from *Method* is taken almost verbatim from “Horizons,” 9.

¹²⁵ Ibid. In addition to “Horizons,” see “What are Judgments of Value?” one lecture in a series given at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1972, published in *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 140-56.

¹²⁶ And beyond moral self-transcendence, there is “religious self-transcendence,” to be discussed in section 3. For a wonderful, concise exposition of this three-fold self-transcendence, and an excellent introduction

“initial thrust towards moral self-transcendence” occurs after intellectual self-transcendence, and is “constituted by the judgment of value.”¹²⁷ In *Method in Theology* Lonergan builds on the cognitive analysis of *Insight*, adding an analysis of feelings as “intentional responses to value” and the judgment of value.¹²⁸

As judgments of truth judge insights, so judgments of value judge feelings. Feelings in *Method* play an expanded and perhaps substantially different role from that in *Insight*. Whereas *Insight* discusses feelings as arising from sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity on a level *before* and *below* the intellectual search for intelligibility and truth, *Method* distinguishes between two types of feelings, “non-intentional states and trends” and “intentional responses,”¹²⁹ the first of which seems to function before and below understanding and knowledge, while the second operates on a *higher* level than insight and judgment of fact. For example, irritability is an example of a non-intentional state. One typically will feel irritability before one understands what the cause is. Hunger is an example of a non-intentional trend. Hunger, in general, does not intend a particular object. It is not the result of intentionally apprehending and desiring some object. On the other hand, one may have a very specific, intentional longing for a particular type of food after seeing, smelling, imagining, conceiving, or discussing it.

to Lonergan’s thought in general, see his essay, “Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious” (full reference above, at note 47).

¹²⁷ *Method*, 38.

¹²⁸ Only once does Lonergan mention judgment of value in *Insight*, and that is in the limited context of a judgment of the value of belief (p. 730). Again, much of *Method*’s discussion of feelings and judgment of value is taken almost verbatim from “Horizons,” cited in full above. A helpful secondary source on moral self-transcendence, feelings, and judgments of value is Brian Cronin, *Value Ethics: A Lonergan Perspective* (Nairobi: Consolatia Institute of Philosophy, 2006).

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 30-31. Lonergan cites his dependence for these distinctions on Dietrich von Hildebrand’s *Christian Ethics* (New York: David McKay, 1953).

This particular, intentional longing is the type of feeling that arises after and above experience, understanding and judgment of fact.¹³⁰

Such an intentional feeling is subject to a judgment of value in a way parallel to how insight is subject to a judgment of fact. As insight grasps possible truth, so intentional feelings apprehend *possible* value.¹³¹ Lonergan attributes an indispensable role to such feelings, calling them “the mass and momentum and power of ... conscious living.”¹³² However, he asserts that a person’s desires may exceed an object’s actual value, or one’s fears may be misplaced. “What is agreeable may very well be what also is a true good. But it also happens that what is a true good may be disagreeable.”¹³³ Hence the expression, “bitter medicine.”

Because feelings apprehend only apparent or possible value, the further step of a judgment of value is required if one wishes to reach true values, or goods that exist in this world as independent of oneself or as “virtually unconditioned.” Good judgments of value are not arbitrary impositions of the will. Rather, they build on a person’s past experiences, insights, and judgments of both fact and value. Furthermore, “the judgment of value presupposes knowledge of human life, of human possibilities proximate and remote, of the probable consequences of projected courses of action.”¹³⁴ Ideally, it considers not simply personal preferences, but the entirety of creation and history.

The identification of a virtually unconditioned value is achieved in a “simple” judgment of value. Additionally there is a “comparative judgment of value” that

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid., 37.

¹³² *Method*, 65.

¹³³ Ibid., 31.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 38.

determines which value or values is/are better or more urgent in general or in a particular circumstance.¹³⁵ Life does not just involve choices between apparent and actual goods but also choices among various true goods. Comparative judgments perform the needed task of sorting out values. As a general scheme, Lonergan orders values in a dynamic, interdependent hierarchy, parallel to emergent probability's hierarchy of being.¹³⁶ He calls this hierarchy a "scale of values." On the first level are "vital values," such as physical health. Then come "social values," particularly the good of order that relates vital values and provides the context for their fulfillment—the economy, for example. Thirdly, "cultural values" are grounded on vital and social values, yet they stand in judgment over vital and social goods, assigning meaning and value in community. Freedom of speech would be an example. Fourth are "personal values," the values of persons themselves, persons as self-transcendent, as loving and beloved, as creative, as originator of value. Finally, there are "religious values," which regard ultimate value, the divine.¹³⁷

It is the role of the compound judgment of value to order and relate values, ideally according to their relationship to all things in the created world and to God. Judgments of value, both simple and compound, are, as stated above, the "initial thrust to moral self-transcendence." The fullness of moral self-transcendence lies not in judgments, however, but in decision and action.

1.4.1.4. Decision, Liberty, and Moral Self-Transcendence

¹³⁵ Ibid., 31, 39; "Horizons," 16-17

¹³⁶ discussed above in section 1.2.4.

¹³⁷ *Method*, 31, 39.

Together with value judgments, decision constitutes the fourth and final level of Lonergan's transcendental method—a method human persons use in all walks of life to effect personal and social progress. Decision builds upon the knowledge gained by a person's experience, understanding, and judgment. In decision one broadens one's consciousness from a "disinterested" focus on the true and the good independent of me and my desires, to an "existential" concern for my concrete role in relation to the whole. One becomes interested not simply in knowing reality but in transforming reality. There is a shift from intellectual self-transcendence to moral self-transcendence. As the older, faculty psychology would have put it, decision is an activity of the will.¹³⁸

The turning point from judgment to decision, or from knowing to doing is a question—just as it was for the transitions from experience to understanding and from understanding to judgment. However, the question for decision does not arise so much from the pure, disinterested desire to know, but from a personal and existential concern. After the unrestricted desire to know has brought one to relatively objective judgments about reality and the possibilities for reality, one spontaneously begins to wonder in a more subjective manner: What should *I* do?¹³⁹

Typically, a person becomes aware of multiple possible courses of action, of many options to choose from. The decision-making process, or "deliberation," requires that a person evaluate each course carefully. An authentic, morally self-transcendent

¹³⁸ Faculty psychology is based on the Aristotelian, metaphysical view of the soul as comprised of various metaphysical faculties, including the intellect and the will. See *Method*, 95-96, 259-60,

¹³⁹ Lonergan discusses the four levels in a series throughout the first chapter of *Method*. The spontaneity of deliberative wonder is found on p. 18. Lonergan acknowledges the possibility that one may not care to ask what one should do. The extreme of this he calls "psychopaths" and a milder type, the "drifter" (On psychopaths see *Method*, 18. On drifters see *Method*, 40; "Existenz and Aggiornamento," 242; *Topics in Education*, 46.) More will be said on the drifter in section 3.2.2.

decision is made in accord not simply with a calculus of pleasure and pain, but with one's prior judgments of fact and value.¹⁴⁰ However, while decision is based on one's prior judgments, it has a very different character from judgments. A judgment is made in light of the unconditional desire to know. This desire drives one with a certain necessity to assent to the virtually unconditioned truth or value of an existing thing. A decision, however, does not have the same exigent character of necessity. Rather, there is a great degree of personal freedom in decision.

This is not to say that decisions are completely unguided or open-ended. As mentioned above, they are based on and should be made in accord with one's prior judgments of truth and value. Moreover, the existential character of decision gives it the weight of personal responsibility. When making a choice, a person is choosing not simply one good among other goods, but also what to make of him/herself and of her/his world.¹⁴¹ Thus, decision is an exercise of freedom, but it can also transform the future context of one's freedom and decision. Due to this reciprocal relationship between freedom and decision, Lonergan distinguishes two types of freedom. There is the "essential freedom" that human beings have in the abstract, simply by nature of being human. In the concrete, however, a person's choices can expand or limit her/his actual or "effective" freedom.¹⁴²

Applying a spatial metaphor, Lonergan demonstrates the existential significance of decision. He distinguishes between (1) the freedom to choose a particular good from a

¹⁴⁰ *Method*, 50. Authenticity is the topic of the next section.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 121.

¹⁴² See *Insight*, 643-47.

set of goods and thus to transform the set, and (2) a related but greater ability to choose oneself and thus to transform one's entire world. It is the distinction between choosing from *particular goods* within a horizon and choosing the *horizon itself*. "Horizon" is Lonergan's term for the scope of a person's or a group's knowledge and interest. "Horizontal liberty" enables a person to select particular things within a given horizon. The positive exercise of "vertical liberty" is a wondrous leap of freedom, a whole new level of self-transcendence that allows for the broadening one's whole horizon and thus a radical increase in the available goods to be known, desired, loved, and served.¹⁴³

In other words, morally self-transcendent decision and action would increase a person's "effective freedom." Morally speaking, an exercise of vertical liberty increases not only the selection of particular goods available for the choosing, but it also increases one's future ability to make good choices. Over time, a person grows in the discernment of values. Her/his feelings change. Ideally, true goods that once felt dissatisfying become satisfying, and lesser goods that were overvalued become viewed in proper perspective.¹⁴⁴ With this development of knowledge and feeling, one grows in liberty. One becomes less and less a slave to one's satisfactions and less and less attracted to merely apparent goods.

When we decide to do the good that we have judged, and when we act on this decision, we achieve a full measure of moral self-transcendence, and we become

¹⁴³ Ibid., 40-41. Lonergan credits Joseph de Finance for the insights into vertical and horizontal liberty and refers us to de Finance's book, *Essai sur l'agir humain* (Rome: Presses de l'Université Grégorienne, 1962), 287 ff. Cf., *Method*, 235-37; *Topics in Education*, 88-91; and the entire essay, "Horizons."

¹⁴⁴ *Method*, 32.

“principles of benevolence and beneficence, capable of genuine collaboration and of true love.”¹⁴⁵

1.4.2. Authenticity

The key to Lonergan’s ideas about transcendental method and human progress is the notion of authenticity. Thus far, we have used the term “authentic” to identify correct judgments and good decisions, and we have said Lonergan’s standard for achieving objectivity is the authentic subject. Authenticity, thus, identifies both a type of operation and a type of person. Furthermore, it is the result of, the cause of, and in some ways the same as personal self-transcendence and social progress.¹⁴⁶

The notion of authenticity underlies Lonergan’s rather sunny views on human nature and human history. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, nature and progress are theoretical abstractions. The current, concrete reality of human existence is always a mixture of nature, sin and grace—or progress, decline, and redemption. Reality is complex. Perhaps surprisingly, however, Lonergan believes that precisely because reality is complex, it is helpful to abstract particular aspects of reality in order to facilitate clear consideration of concrete problems and thereby to increase the likelihood of solving these problems.

In order not to gain an unrealistically positive image of the human situation, or an equally unrealistic and negative view of Lonergan’s thought, it is important to remember that authentic human operation is an abstraction, merely an aspect of the whole picture.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 35. Cf., 104, 289.

¹⁴⁶ See *Method*, 104: “Man achieves authenticity in self-transcendence;” and Ibid., 228: “Authenticity can be shown to generate progress...” (Complete quote to follow.)

As Lonergan writes, “Authenticity can be shown to generate progress, unauthenticity to bring about decline, while the problem of overcoming decline provides an introduction to religion.”¹⁴⁷

Authenticity is an ideal. But it is an ideal that can be very helpful for human living—just as while nothing falls at 9.8 meters per second squared, the abstraction of earthly gravity is helpful for technological development. In reality, authenticity is not merely the product of natural human capabilities but also of divine grace. We shall leave the graced aspects of authenticity to the third chapter of this part and focus now on three natural aids to promoting authenticity.

First, and very practically, Lonergan presents four guidelines for authentic observance of the transcendental method. They are called the “transcendental precepts”: be attentive; be intelligent; be reasonable; and be responsible.¹⁴⁸

On an empirical level one should *be attentive* in order to get the most out of one’s experience. One pays attention by directing one’s intentional consciousness to an object or objects and thus shifting one’s awareness of an object from the “background” of one’s mind to the “foreground.” By paying attention, one gathers more data on the world, including oneself. On the next level, when understanding, it is best to *be intelligent*. Intelligence is the ability to grasp patterns or relationships. It is manifested in spontaneous questions. By intelligent wonder, one comes to better ideas. To make the best judgments, one should *be reasonable*. Being reasonable does not mean abiding always by logic but making critical conclusions based on the best ideas verified by solid

¹⁴⁷ *Method*, 288.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 53, 55, 231.

evidence. In reasonable judgment one comes to know truth. Finally, good decisions require that one *be responsible*. Responsibility is the ability to conform one's actions to one's knowledge and values, as well as the awareness that one's choices affect not merely the objects that one chooses but also oneself and the entire world. Ultimately, personal responsibility entails acting out "of benevolence and beneficence, of honest collaboration and of true love."¹⁴⁹

These precepts are of fundamental import not only to academic disciplines or to personal self-transcendence but to the entire range of practical and social progress:

Being intelligent includes a grasp of hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities. Being reasonable includes the rejection of what probably would not work but also the acknowledgement of what probably would. Being responsible includes basing one's decisions and choices on an unbiased evaluation of short-term and long-term costs and benefits to oneself, to one's group, to other groups.

Progress, of course, is not some single improvement but a continuous flow of them.... So change begets change, and the sustained observance of the transcendental precepts makes these cumulative changes an instance of progress.¹⁵⁰

The transcendental precepts are internal commands, built into human consciousness. When followed, they move us beyond ourselves to authenticity in our experience, understanding, judgment and decision. They are rooted in a vague awareness of a reality beyond our knowing. No matter how much a person knows or even how much society as a whole knows, there are limits to this knowledge. When we become aware of our limits, we encounter a "known unknown," which we can probe in our questions.¹⁵¹ Though our encounter with the known unknown may only be a vague awareness, we will not be content to rest in ignorance, for the known unknown causes a "radical intending

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 104. Collaboration and love are topics for our next section.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 53.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 23-24, 74, 77, 287.

that moves us from ignorance to knowledge” and to conscientious action in line with this knowledge.¹⁵² This radical intending of the unknown that drives us through questions to increase our knowledge Lonergan calls the “transcendental notions.” They are our second natural aid in authenticity:

The transcendental notions are the dynamism of conscious intentionality. They promote the subject from lower to higher levels of consciousness, from the experiential to the intellectual, from the intellectual to the rational, from the rational to the existential.... Not only do the transcendental notions promote the subject to full consciousness and direct him to his goals. They also provide the criteria that reveal whether the goals are being reached.¹⁵³

There is a dual meaning in the transcendental notions. On the one hand “*they intend everything about everything*” and on the other “it is *by them that we intend* the concrete, i.e., all that is to be known about a thing.”¹⁵⁴ They are both “the *very dynamism* of our conscious intending”¹⁵⁵ and “*what is intended*”¹⁵⁶ by our conscious operations. Lonergan states clearly that the transcendental notions are “beauty,” “the intelligible,” “the true,” “the real” or “being,” and “the good” or “value.”¹⁵⁷

The first four notions, beauty, the intelligible, the true, and the real/being are intended on the first three levels of consciousness: experience, understanding, and judgment. This means that we are not content to appreciate and to know one thing or one

¹⁵² Ibid., 11. See also 34-35.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 23, emphasis added.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 12, emphasis added.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 34, emphasis added. I believe this dual meaning has something to do with Aristotle’s notion of the final cause—a good which is both the final goal and the original mover/motive.

¹⁵⁷ *Method*, 13, 34, 36. Lonergan cautions against confusing these transcendental notions with often mistaken, rigid concepts of them (Ibid., 12).

aspect of a thing. Deep down, when the noise of the world is stilled, we naturally want to know and to appreciate “everything about everything.”¹⁵⁸

On the fourth level, decision-making, the transcendental notion of value or the good prevents one from finding *peace* until one has acted in a way that is truly good for all people, in both the short term and the long run. The notion of transcendent value drives consciousness into *conscience*. “The nagging conscience is the recurrence of the original question that has not been met. The good conscience is the peace of mind that confirms the choice of something truly worthwhile.”¹⁵⁹

Lonergan summarizes his position that the transcendental notions function as standards for authenticity immanent in human consciousness:

The drive to understand is satisfied when understanding is reached but it is dissatisfied with every incomplete attainment and so it is the source of ever further questions. The drive to truth compels rationality to assent when evidence is sufficient but refuses assent and demands doubt whenever evidence is insufficient. The drive to value rewards success in self-transcendence with a happy conscience and saddens failures with an unhappy conscience.¹⁶⁰

This quote makes it seem as though a human person has multiple drives and desires, the desire for intelligibility, another one for truth, and a final one for value. In some ways this may be true, however Lonergan writes that “the many levels of conscious intentionality are just successive stages in the unfolding of a single thrust, the eros of the human spirit.”¹⁶¹ This “eros of the human spirit” is the third natural aid for authenticity

¹⁵⁸ *Method*, 23; “Openness and Religious Experience,” 200. Cf., *Insight*, 373. Beauty, art, and aesthetics play interesting but relatively undeveloped roles in Lonergan’s thought. See *Insight*, 208-12, 291-92, 315; *Method*, 13, 61-4, 73-74, 272-4; *Topics in Education*, Ch. 9, “Art.”

¹⁵⁹ “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” 174. The “original question” is, What should I do? Cf., *Method*, 35, 40.

¹⁶⁰ *Method*, 35.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 13.

and perhaps the most important and most fundamental of the three. It grounds and pervades all of Lonergan's thought.

In *Insight* Lonergan speaks of this eros as a "pure," "unrestricted," "detached," and "disinterested," desire to know. This fundamental human desire impels a person from experience to understanding and from understanding to judgment, prodding the person to perform each operation correctly. Lonergan expounds:

By the desire to know is meant the dynamic orientation manifested in questions for intelligence and for reflection The desire to know, then, is simply the inquiring and critical spirit of man. By moving him to seek understanding, it prevents him from being content with the mere flow of outer and inner experience. By demanding adequate understanding, it involves man in the self-correcting process of learning in which further questions yield complementary insights. By moving man to reflect, to seek the unconditioned, to grant unqualified assent only to the unconditioned, it prevents him from being content with hearsay and legend, with unverified hypotheses and untested theories.¹⁶²

The domain of the pure desire to know is not limited to cold facts about existing realities, it seeks also to discern the value of things¹⁶³ and to identify various "practical possibilities"¹⁶⁴ for transforming the world. Lonergan asserts that human beings are doers as well as knowers, and that the pure desire to know unites these aspects of the human person, promoting a desire for harmony between them. In other words, "from that identity of consciousness there springs an exigence for *self-consistency* in knowing and doing."¹⁶⁵

By our very nature, we human beings desire not only to know and to value reality wisely, we want to choose in line with this wisdom the best possible course of action, and

¹⁶² *Insight*, 372.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 624-25; *Method* 12-13.

¹⁶⁴ *Insight*, 622.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, emphasis added.

finally we wish to actually follow this wisely chosen course of action. Without such “self-consistency” a person is tempted to do one or more of three things: (1) to “avoid self-consciousness” and the “precept of the sage... ‘Know thyself,’”¹⁶⁶ (2) to rationalize his/her inconsistencies, i.e., dishonestly tell oneself that one’s actions are not vicious or even that vices themselves are virtuous, and/or (3) perhaps most commonly, to face one’s wrongdoings and acknowledge that they are a vices, but in an act of “moral renunciation... [give] up any hope of amending” and claim, “If you please, it is very human.”¹⁶⁷

In *Method*, the “pure” and “detached” desire to know of *Insight*, with its complementary exigence for self-consistency, becomes unified and filled out in a broader moral, existential, and even religious context as “a single thrust, the eros of the human spirit.” This unified eros drives human self-transcendence. In fact, it is called the “unrestricted thrust to self-transcendence.”¹⁶⁸ And because the human person “achieves authenticity in self-transcendence,” this eros is the drive and the standard for authentic self-transcendence. In its augmentation of *Insight*’s focus on the desire to know, *Method* reveals that a relationship of love, a “being in love,” is the final fulfillment of pure desire or of self-transcendence: “Just as *unrestricted questioning* is our capacity for self-transcendence, so *being in love in an unrestricted fashion* is the proper fulfillment of that

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 622-23. See also, “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 25-26.

¹⁶⁸ *Method*, 115. Ibid., 115-16: “Since this thrust is of intelligence to the intelligible, of reasonableness to the true and the real, of freedom and responsibility to the truly good, the experienced fulfillment of that thrust may be objectified as a clouded revelation of absolute intelligence and intelligibility, absolute truth and reality, absolute goodness and holiness.”

capacity.”¹⁶⁹ This quote demonstrates that the roots of *Method*’s language of self-transcendence lie in *Insight*’s language of question and insight. It also discloses that while *Insight*’s pure desire to know is fulfilled in infinite Understanding, Truth, and Being,¹⁷⁰ *Method*’s expanded, unrestricted thrust to self-transcendence finds its term in relationship with an “other-worldly” Love.¹⁷¹ For Lonergan, this realm of unrestricted, otherworldly love is the realm of religion.

Just as there is a unity in the eros of the human spirit, there is a unity in its apparent goals. Those with training in traditional Catholic philosophy or theology will recognize the seeming multiplicity of human fulfillment—in transcendent Being, in Beauty, in Intelligibility, in Intelligence, in Truth, Reality, Goodness, Value and Love—to in fact be *one* fulfillment, namely *God*. Thus, the natural eros of the human spirit is a natural desire for God.

In *Method*, Lonergan makes it clear that the transcendental notions are notions of God, that the pure desire to know and the erotic thrust to self-transcendence are the desire for God, and that the natural human desire for unity with God has precedent in traditional Catholic theology when he acknowledges his debt in this manner to Thomas Aquinas. Lonergan connects his pure desire to know with Thomas’s language of the “beatific

¹⁶⁹ *Method*, 106, emphasis added. Cf., 242: “Questions for intelligence, for reflection, for deliberation reveal the eros of the human spirit, its capacity and its desire for self-transcendence. But that capacity meets fulfillment, that desire turns to joy, when religious conversion transforms the existential subject into a subject in love, a subject held, grasped, possessed, owned through a total and so an other-worldly love.”

¹⁷⁰ *Insight*, 372-76, 680-708.

¹⁷¹ *Method*, 242, 289.

vision,” i.e., an intimate unity with God conceived of as knowledge of God, neither by likeness nor by faith, but by some sharing in and understanding of God’s own essence.¹⁷²

Never is this belief in a natural desire for God explicitly traced back to Augustine’s famous words at the opening of the *Confessions*: “You are great, Lord, and highly to be praised,... you have made us for yourself, and *our heart is restless* until it *rests in you*.”¹⁷³ However, Lonergan alludes to it. Discussing a “disenchantment” that arises when a person compares her or his limited achievements with the transcendental of the good, he mentions the possibility of *rest* in a perfect goodness:

That disenchantment brings to light the limitation in every finite achievement, the stain in every flawed perfection, the irony of soaring ambition and faltering performance. It plunges us into the height and depth of love, but it also keeps us aware of how much our living falls short of its aim. In brief, the transcendental notion of the good so invites, presses, harries us, that we could rest only in an encounter with a goodness completely beyond its powers of criticism.¹⁷⁴

Eternal rest in loving relationship with God is the ultimate aim of human self-transcendence. In this life, however, God has given human beings not rest but a natural desire. It is a natural desire for a supernatural fulfillment, a human yearning for perfect, unrestricted Love, Good, Truth, Being, Intelligibility, and Beauty. This unified, transcendent desire underlies all human activities. It underlies the “going beyond” that begins when one opens one’s eyes or when one attends to one’s own feelings and sense of wonder. It is the source of spontaneous questions, of the search for satisfying answers, and of the exigence toward conscientious action in society. The natural desire to know

¹⁷² *Topics in Education*, 91, 173, 224. On p. 91 Thomas’s work on the matter is located in the *Summa contra Gentiles*, Bk. 3, chs. 25-63; and the *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 12, a. 1; a 8, ad 4m; q. 62, a. 1; 1-2, q. 3, a. 8.

¹⁷³ Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. Henry Chadwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), Bk 1, Ch. 1, emphasis added.

¹⁷⁴ *Method*, 36.

grounds transcendental precepts: Be Attentive! Be Intelligent! Be Reasonable! and Be Responsible! It works with transcendental notions, providing a peace when one has authentically carried out the operations of conscious intentionality.

“Man achieves authenticity in self-transcendence.”¹⁷⁵ Self-transcendence is the process of four transcendental operations guided by four transcendental precepts, seeking four levels of transcendental notions, and driven by a single thrust of the erotic human spirit.

Even with these natural aids and impulses, authenticity is not automatic. It is rather, a constant struggle against inauthenticity, against complacency, mistakes, and sins. It is, as Lonergan writes, “never a permanent achievement. It is ever precarious, ever to be achieved afresh, ever in great part a matter of uncovering still more oversights, acknowledging still further failures to understand, correcting still more mistakes, repenting more and more deeply human sins.”¹⁷⁶

In human history, there is progress, and there is decline. The full account of human authenticity involves not merely the natural process of transcendental method and transcendent desire, but also the failures of that method and the infidelity to that desire. It would also include an account for divine redemption, for God’s gifts of grace and self-communication, for conversion of human persons on intellectual, moral, and religious levels. But since sin, grace, and conversion belong to distinct vectors of Lonergan’s analysis of human history, we save them for chapters two and three on decline and redemption. Let us now turn to another natural aid in human development, the original

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 104.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 252; cf., 110.

and larger context of personal transcendental operations: the cooperating human community.

1.5. The Cooperating Human Community

In the preceding section, we considered the “larger picture” of Lonergan’s account of anthropology, his transcendental method. We discussed how an unrestricted desire for ultimate truth and goodness drives the human person through multiple operations on four levels of conscious intentionality. But this larger picture is incomplete, for progress is driven, not by the operations of isolated individuals, but by the cooperation of persons bound by love and mutual meaning into a communal matrix Lonergan calls “the human good.”

1.5.1. Love

Authenticity in experience, understanding, judgment, and decision lead to intellectual and moral self-transcendence. But there is a third transcendence Lonergan calls “affective.” It transcends intellectual and moral self-transcendence, advancing beyond their limits.¹⁷⁷

Affective self-transcendence and moral self-transcendence are intimately linked. The peak of moral self-transcendence reaches to the base of affective self-transcendence. Thus, as quoted earlier, Lonergan wrote that it is through morally self-transcendent, responsible decision that people “*can be* principles of benevolence and beneficence, *capable* of genuine collaboration and of true love.”¹⁷⁸ Moral self-transcendence does not

¹⁷⁷ In *Method*, Lonergan discusses self-transcendence as intellectual, moral, and affective. Affective self-transcendence is falling in love (intimacy, husband and wife, parents and children, mankind, and other-worldly).

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 35, emphasis added. Cf., 289. It was quoted at the end of section 1.4.1, above.

seem in itself to be benevolence and beneficence or collaboration and love. Rather, it is the condition for the possibility of these things and for affective self-transcendence. As Lonergan states in a very similar passage later in *Method*, “moral self-transcendence is the *possibility* of benevolence and beneficence, of honest collaboration and true love, of swinging completely out of the habitat of an animal and becoming a person in human society.”¹⁷⁹

What is affective self-transcendence? Simply put, it is falling in love, staying in love, and growing in love.¹⁸⁰ There is, however, a great complexity to love. First of all, love is of many types: “There is the love of intimacy, of husband and wife, of parents and children; the love for one’s fellow men with its fruit in the achievement of human welfare. There is the love of God with one’s whole heart and whole soul, with all one’s mind and all one’s strength (Mk. 12, 30).”¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 104. It is important to note, however, that in concrete reality, love actually *precedes* moral deeds, as we shall see in the next section on “the way from above downwards” and in section 3.2. on conversions.

¹⁸⁰ Some scholars believe Lonergan’s affective self-transcendence and affective conversion to be the same as eminent Lonergan scholar Fr. Robert Doran’s “psychic conversion.” Based on a limited knowledge of Fr. Doran’s psychic conversion, I would disagree. It is clear that affective self-transcendence, conversion, and development pertain to feelings. However, it seems that Lonergan distinguishes between affective development on the one hand and affective self-transcendence and conversion on the other. The former pertains to *Insight*’s pre-cognitive spontaneous sensitivity and intersubjectivity or to *Method*’s non-intentional states and trends, while the latter deals with higher feelings, the post-cognitive, intentional response to value and love. On *Method*, 289 Lonergan discusses affective self-transcendence in a trio with intellectual and moral self-transcendence and in “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” 179, Lonergan mentions affective conversion in a trio with intellectual and moral conversions. In both cases, the affective component relates to interpersonal love, between people and with God. Thus, I contend that affective self-transcendence and conversion are like *religious* conversion/self-transcendence, but *broader*, because they include falling in love with other people as well as with God. Religious conversion does include falling in love other human people, but it stresses the priority of the relationship with God. Fr. Doran’s psychic conversion, on the other hand, seems to pertain not directly to love, but to pre-cognitive, non-intentional feelings. These are notional distinctions, and of course, concretely, feelings are mixed and love, while a higher-level operation, may precede knowing.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 105; cf., 289. This is the love of charity, to be discussed below in section 3.

When speaking of moral and affective self-transcendence, Lonergan is building on Aristotle's, Augustine's, and Aquinas's discussions of virtue, love, and friendship. At the end of his presentation of moral self-transcendence, Lonergan mentions that the fundamental principle of morality is the authentic person or "a fully developed self-transcendent subject." He states that this morally developed, authentic person is what Aristotle named a *virtuous* person.¹⁸² This is similar to Augustine's claim that "if one loves God, one may do as one pleases, *Ama Deum et fac quod vis*."¹⁸³ Love helps one to order values correctly. This is particularly true if one is in love with God. Thomas Aquinas brings the two together in his belief that the love of God, charity, is a virtue (infused or theological) and "the mother and root of all virtues"¹⁸⁴

Additionally, when Lonergan speaks of the possibility of "benevolence and beneficence" and "of genuine collaboration and of true love," he is speaking of the mutual love that Aristotle called *friendship*, particularly the friendship of shared virtue or *excellence*.¹⁸⁵ Like friends who share virtue, those in love treat one another as valuable, not simply for what each brings the other, but because each person is valuable, in and of her/himself. Good friends collaborate with one another, wishing each other well and working for the good of each other.

¹⁸² Ibid., 41. In a footnote Lonergan adduces a few references from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bk. II, that indicate that the standard for virtue is the virtuous person.

¹⁸³ *Method*, 39. Lonergan is paraphrasing Augustine's "*Dilige et quod vis fac*," found in his seventh homily on the letter of John ("*Epistula Ioannis ad Parthenos*," VII, 8).

¹⁸⁴ *Summa Theologica*, 1-2, q. 62, a. 4, resp.; cf. q. 62. More will be said on the love of God in chapter three of this dissertation.

¹⁸⁵ Lonergan does not cite Aristotle on friendship in *Method*, but he does in "Finality, Love, Marriage," 24-25. See Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, particularly Bks. 8 and 9.

True love is the peak in the development of feelings as intentional response to value. It is “the supreme illustration” of “feelings so deep and strong... that they channel attention, shape one’s horizon, direct one’s life.”¹⁸⁶ For Lonergan love is a feeling, an intentional response to value, but it is also much more than a feeling. It is the fullness of human authenticity, self-transcendence, and the unrestricted desire. It is a dynamic state that is at once a principle of rest and of movement.¹⁸⁷ Lonergan writes most eloquently of love—in a kind of breathless and bursting way:¹⁸⁸

One can live in a world, have a horizon, just in the measure that one is not locked up in oneself. A first step towards this liberation is the sensitivity we share with the higher animals. But they are confined to a habitat, while man lives in a universe. Beyond sensitivity man asks questions, and his questioning is unrestricted....

The transcendental notions, that is, our questions for intelligence, for reflection, and for deliberation, constitute our capacity for self-transcendence. That capacity becomes an actuality when one falls in love. Then one’s being becomes a being-in-love. Such being-in-love has its antecedents, its causes, its conditions, its occasions. But once it has blossomed forth and as long as it lasts it takes over. It is the first principle. From it flow one’s desires and fears, one’s joys and sorrows, one’s discernment of values, one’s decisions and deeds.¹⁸⁹

For self-transcendence reaches its term not in righteousness but in love and, when we fall in love, then life begins anew. A new principle takes over and, as long as it lasts, we are lifted above ourselves and carried along as parts within an ever more intimate yet ever more liberating dynamic whole.¹⁹⁰

A man or woman that falls in love is engaged in loving not only when attending to the beloved but at all times. Besides particular acts of loving, there is the prior state of being in love, and that prior state is, as it were, the fount of all one’s actions. So mutual love is the intertwining of two lives. It transforms an “I” and “thou” into a “we” so intimate, so secure, so permanent, that each attends, imagines, thinks, plans, feels, speaks, acts in concern for both.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 32, as well as in his soteriological writings, as we shall see in the next chapter.

¹⁸⁷ Love as a principle of rest and of movement is mentioned many times in *Method*, but in “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” pp. 172-75, Lonergan discusses the roots of this in Aristotle’s definition of nature.

¹⁸⁸ In fact, I know of an atheist couple who used excerpts from Lonergan’s discussion on love in *Method* in their wedding ceremony.

¹⁸⁹ *Method*, 104-5; cf., “Horizons,” 11; “Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious,” 325-27.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 175.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 32-33.

Love for Lonergan is at the crossroads of a person's conscious intentionality and a society's common good. It overlaps the natural process of progress and the supernatural graces of redemption. In this chapter on progress we must limit ourselves to the love that is theoretically possible to a nature that itself is a theoretic construct yet immensely helpful.¹⁹² In the third chapter we will examine the supernatural aspects of love, i.e., the summit of being in love with God.¹⁹³

1.5.2. The Way From Above Downwards

Love for Lonergan is the fullness of human authenticity, self-transcendence, and the unrestricted desire. It is the result of an affective self-transcendence that goes beyond moral and intellectual self-transcendence. As both the principle of movement and rest, it brings peace and friendship, new personal feelings and new communal cooperation. It is both a fulfillment and a new beginning. In addition to being a foundation for personal authenticity and for social collaboration, love has the intriguing ability to reverse the order of the operations in human conscious intentionality.

Typically, knowledge precedes love, as formulated in the scholastic expression *Nihil amatum nisi praecognitum* (Nothing is loved if it is not first known). For Lonergan, this is true "ordinarily."¹⁹⁴ Decision ordinarily presupposes judgment, judgment ordinarily

¹⁹² For Lonergan's excellent account of the development of the theoretical category of nature, see the first chapter of his dissertation published as, *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000).

¹⁹³ Without grace, it is possible, but not probable for a person to love God. In "Finality, Love, Marriage," p. 25., Lonergan cites Thomas as saying, "Even without grace man naturally loves God but, from the corruption of nature, rational will seeks self," citing *Summa Theologica*, 1-2, q. 109, a. 3 c. The editor notes that the quote is "*ad sensum*"). In *Insight* Lonergan affirms a natural love for God, as primary intelligence, primary truth, primary good (679-81). But this is not the full love of God with one's whole heart, soul, mind and strength that Lonergan speaks of in *Method*.

¹⁹⁴ *Method*, 122; cf., 278, 283, 340.

presupposes understanding, and understanding ordinarily presupposes experience.

Despite this norm,

there is a knowledge born of love. Of it Pascal spoke when he remarked that the heart has reasons which reason does not know.... The meaning, then, of Pascal's remark would be that, besides the factual knowledge reached by experiencing, understanding, and verifying, there is another kind of knowledge reached through the discernment of value and the judgments of value, of a person in love.¹⁹⁵

To the ordinary way of knowing, Lonergan distinguishes two exceptions, a "minor" and a "major." Both reverse the ordinary priority of knowing to loving. Both are forms of "a knowledge born of love." The major exception flows from God's love flooding our hearts, and will be discussed later. The minor exception begins when people fall in love with each other. This love, like all loves, is "a new beginning, an exercise in vertical liberty in which one's world undergoes a new organization."¹⁹⁶ Love is an exercise in vertical liberty because, while the world remains largely unchanged, the lover's personal world or horizon expands. Love reveals new values, and because values are related, one is forced to reevaluate all of one's older values in light of the new ones. Thus, love reorganizes one's world. It occasions a new beginning.

Love's revelation of new values and its transformation of old values reverses the typical order that moves from experiencing to understanding and feeling, through making judgments of truth and value, to commitment and decision. Using a spatial metaphor,

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 115. This passage in *Method* is taken from "Horizons," where the Pascal quote is quoted in French, "le Coeur a ses raisons que la raison ne connaît point; on le sait en milles choses," and located in *Pensées, d'après l'édition de L. Brunschvicg* (Londres: M. Dent & Sons, n.d.; Paris: Georges Crés en Cie, n.d.) no. 277, p. 120.

¹⁹⁶ *Method*, 122. "Vertical liberty" was first discussed above in section 1.4.1.4.

Lonergan calls this ordinary process the way “from below upwards” and love’s reversal of this process, the way “from above downwards.”¹⁹⁷

In this second way, love operates primarily on the fourth, the highest, level of conscious intentionality. There it creates new existential commitments. These commitments shape the decisions we make about how to live in society. Moving down to Lonergan’s third level of consciousness, the commitments and decisions of love inform new judgments of value and new judgments of truth. Such judgments informed by love are not necessarily subjective and biased. They may be, if the love that informs them is biased. But for Lonergan, genuine love flows into objective, authentic judgments.¹⁹⁸

Continuing our move “downwards,” love provides a new horizon for understanding. A person dedicated to love and judging with love will be more likely to come to certain ideas or insights, and less likely to have others. Finally, love transforms the way we experience the world. When we fall in love, we not only have new commitments, new judgments, and new ideas, but also new ways of being sensitive and spontaneously intersubjective.¹⁹⁹ At the very least, our prior decisions, judgments, and ideas influence the way we attend to our experience, the things to which we pay attention.

1.5.3. The World Mediated by Meaning and Belief

Love need not always be the fiery experience depicted in romance novels, the kind of love that consumes all of one’s attention. Love, particularly as it ages, can slip

¹⁹⁷ “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” 180-81.

¹⁹⁸ More will be said below, on “belief,” in chapter two, under “bias,” and in chapter three, under “conversion.”

¹⁹⁹ If the love in question is the love of God, then “[t]he world is charged with the grandeur of God,” as Gerard Manley Hopkins wrote in his poem, *God’s Grandeur*.

into the background, unattended to, but no less operative and orienting. Such, perhaps, is the general love one may have for one's community. The commitments of the community—the truths and the values it holds, its common-sense fund of understanding, and even the ways it structures one's experiences through common architecture, design, music, and food—provide the background that conditions the possibilities for one's personal growth in discovery and commitment. As we have seen, experience, understanding, judgment, and decision take place within a horizon. The human community forms much of this horizon. But what is community? How is it formed and of what is it constituted?

As usual, Lonergan's answer is complex. Simple physical proximity in a fixed geographic region is not enough to form human communities, nor are they founded on some deliberate "social contract." The individual does not join society out of a rational calculation of its usefulness. Reason and deliberation do shape various communities; however, human society is not initially the product of experience, understanding, judgment, and decision, or even of love. Lonergan asserts that society is founded on something more basic: "Prior to the 'we' that results from the mutual love of an 'I' and a 'thou', there is the earlier 'we' that precedes the distinction of subjects and survives its oblivion."²⁰⁰

This "prior we" is formed by the "spontaneous intersubjectivity," reflected upon earlier. Lonergan believes that by nature human persons have some measure of "fellow-feeling." This is manifested, for example, by the fact that one spontaneously reaches out

²⁰⁰ *Method*, 57.

one's arms to save another person from falling, just as one spontaneously raises one's arms to protect oneself.²⁰¹

Spontaneous intersubjectivity and fellow-feeling are the basic foundation for human communities, but much more than this, human communities are constituted by "common meaning, common values, common purposes, common and complementary activities."²⁰² For Lonergan, common meaning unites these commonalities. Where does common meaning come from? Lonergan believes it forms much like personal meaning. Thus, common meaning may develop from common experience. It becomes formal in common understanding, actual in common judgment of truth and value, and realized in common decision and activities.²⁰³

While the common meaning of a community develops, "from below upwards," by the addition of new insights of creative people who meet new problems and old problems in new ways,²⁰⁴ a person's entry into the community's common fund of meaning follows more of the way "from below downwards." From an early age, one is educated into a tradition. In each tradition there are certain common commitments to values, certain truths held in common, and certain common ways of doing things. Only after one has learned and followed these traditional meanings, values, and practices does one grow in critical understanding of them.²⁰⁵

²⁰¹ Ibid.

²⁰² Ibid., 211.

²⁰³ Ibid., 79; see also "Existenz and Aggiornamento," 243-47.

²⁰⁴ This was discussed above in the section "Insight into Insight."

²⁰⁵ For an excellent discussion and extension of Lonergan's thought on education in a tradition and personal discovery, see Frederick Crowe, S.J., *Old Things and New: A Strategy for Education* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

The process of education in a tradition begins at least as soon as one learns a language. Language is not simply a child's achievement but a community's accumulation. It is the primary means for making common its common meaning.²⁰⁶ Through language, a person's horizon is radically altered. One transcends "the world of immediacy," characterized by mere sensitivity and intersubjective spontaneity, to enter a far richer mode of existence, "the world mediated by meaning."

The infant's world of immediacy is

the world of what is felt, touched, grasped, sucked, seen, heard. It is a world of immediate experience, of the given as given, of image and affect without any perceptible intrusion from insight or concept, reflection or judgment, deliberation or choice. It is the world of pleasure and pain, hunger and thirst, food and drink, rage and satisfaction and sleep.²⁰⁷

However, as one's command of language develops, one's world expands exponentially. "For words denote not only what is present but also what is absent or past or future, not only what is factual but also the possible, the ideal, the normative." But perhaps more importantly, at least from the standpoint of community, is the fact that words express the memories and aspirations, the problems and the solutions, the successes and failures of other people in all walks of life. Through language, we can learn, "from the common sense of the community, from the pages of literature, from the labors of scholars, from the investigations of scientists, from the experience of saints, from the meditations of philosophers and theologians."²⁰⁸

²⁰⁶ Meaning has other carriers, "in human intersubjectivity, in art, in symbols, in language, and in the lives and deeds of persons" (*Method*, 57). For sections covering each of these carriers, see pp. 57-73.

²⁰⁷ *Method*, 76.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 77.

In itself, “the world mediated by meaning” is enormous compared to the infant’s world of immediacy. But entry into this larger world is no guarantee of participation in it. The initial entry is through language, but one participates in it to the extent that one *believes*. Belief tends to be associated almost exclusively with the realm of religion, but Lonergan reminds us of its integral role in any human activity. For example, people around the world orient themselves geographically with maps. But how many have verified for themselves empirically the positions of cities on a map? When using a map we implicitly believe the mapmaker. Furthermore, not only users but makers of maps rely on belief. Larger maps tend to be compilations of smaller ones. And the compiler does not verify all the work of the smaller mapmakers, who themselves rely on the work of surveyors. Every day, however, the accuracy of the maps and the value of belief is verified by the travel of cars, planes, and boats.²⁰⁹

Scientists, too, whose knowing is often contrasted with that of religious believers, depend to a very large part on belief. The advance of science depends on a division of labor that extends across both space and time. No scientist checks all the findings of all other scientists currently working let alone all that went before him or her. This would require repeating all of their experimental observations, formulating all of their hypotheses, verifying all of their conclusions. While scientists verify each other’s work to some degree, without belief among scientists there would be no scientific progress.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 42. This is not to say that maps are perfect.

This highlights the general social and historical character of human knowledge, without which human progress itself would operate, if at all, on a much smaller and slower scale:

There is a progress in knowledge from primitives to moderns only because successive generations began where their predecessors left off. But successive generations could do so, only because they were ready to believe. Without belief, relying on their own individual experience, their own insights, their own judgment, they would have ever been beginning afresh, and either the attainments of primitives would never be surpassed or, if they were, then the benefits would not be transmitted.

Human knowledge, then, is not some individual possession, but rather a common fund, from which each may contribute in the measure that he performs his cognitional operations properly and reports their results accurately.²¹⁰

In fact, Lonergan writes, the “immanently generated knowledge” that comes from a person’s own experience, understanding, and judgment is only a “small fraction of what any civilized man considers himself to know.”²¹¹ Because of this communal, historical aspect to knowing, and in order to promote progress, we must be attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible not only in our personal acts of discovery but also in the communication of our discoveries in writing, etc. On the other hand, because we are aware of the possibility and the actuality of our own error,²¹² we must be aware of the possibility of others’ error. Still, this does not eliminate the value of belief. It simply means that belief must be critical and that progress is “advancing not merely from ignorance to truth but error to truth.”²¹³ We must continually correct our own errors and those of those who preceded us. Due to belief’s central role in human cooperation and progress, authenticity is of paramount importance.

²¹⁰ Ibid., 44.

²¹¹ Ibid., 41.

²¹² Error is not the same as sin. See *Insight*, 690, where Lonergan distinguishes sin from “inadvertent failure.”

²¹³ *Method*, 44. For more on the process of coming to believe, see *Method*, 41-47; and *Insight*, 725-40.

1.5.4. *The Human Good*

We have said that for Lonergan, the human community is constituted primarily by meaning. This is not idealism, for the real is not merely what can be rationally conceived, nor is it simply what can be sensed. Rather, it is what can be known.²¹⁴ “Now the common meanings constitutive of community are not some stock of ideal forms subsistent in some Platonic heaven. They are the hard-won fruit of man’s advancing knowledge of nature, of the gradual evolution of his social forms and of his cultural achievements.”²¹⁵

Lonergan’s term for the advancing human community in all its meaningful and material aspects is “the human good.” All that we have discussed has been part of the human good. The human good is a higher integration of general natural processes, of an authentic individual’s intellectual, moral, and affective self-transcendence, as well as of a community formed by common meaning.

For Lonergan the human good, like anything good, is concrete.²¹⁶ The good is not an abstract aspect of a thing. The good is comprehensive. It includes everything. A common scholastic formula states that being and the good are convertible.²¹⁷ As we have seen, the good is a transcendental notion. Along with Christian tradition, Lonergan believes that God alone is good by essence, while everything else is good by participation.²¹⁸

²¹⁴ *Method*, 20, 38, 93; *Insight*, Chs. 9, 10.

²¹⁵ “Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness,” *A Second Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.: Papers by Bernard Lonergan, S.J.*, 4.

²¹⁶ “What is good, always is concrete,” (*Method*, 27).

²¹⁷ *Ens et bonum convertuntur*, *Topics in Education*, 27.

²¹⁸ *Topics in Education*, 31.

Aristotle affirmed famously that the good is “what everything seeks.”²¹⁹

Lonergan insists that not just the object of human desire is good. The desire itself is good, as is the capacity to desire, the concrete situation in which desire can be fulfilled, and the human operations and cooperation that bring fulfillment.²²⁰ This set of object, desire, concrete situation, operations, and fulfillment, provides the outline for what, in *Topics in Education* and *Method*, Lonergan calls “the invariant structure of the human good.” Let us consider first Lonergan’s earlier and simpler development of the human good in *Topics* and then his later, more complex framework in *Method*.

Like the good in general, the human good includes all of reality, starting with “the forest primeval.”²²¹ The specifically human aspect of the human good is what is realized by human knowledge, choice, and activity. It is a developing reality, progressing with each generation’s new insights, choices, and changed situations. Thus, “the human good is a history, a cumulative process.”²²² It is something to which we all belong and to which we all contribute. It shapes us and we shape it. Concretely it is a compound of human achievement, human sin, and divine redemption. On it depends our “eternal destiny.”²²³

Lonergan analyzes the human good into levels. First and most basic are “particular goods.” A particular good can be any particular thing, such as a pizza or pad thai. It can be an event, a satisfaction, or an activity. It is the satisfaction of a particular appetite.

²¹⁹ Ibid., 28.; cf., Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, I,1,1094a 2.

²²⁰ *Topics in Education*, 28.

²²¹ Ibid., 33, citing Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, *Evangeline*.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ Ibid., 34.

A related set of particular goods organized in a particular way, Lonergan calls a “good of order.” The good of order is “the setup,” a flow of particular goods (similar if not identical to how a scheme recurrence includes an interdependent set of things or events). The good of order is not one more good among other particular goods but the proper organization of particular goods. The economy is an example. All the pieces for a robust economy may be in place, such as raw materials, factories, labor, and consumers, but if these parts are not related harmoniously there is no good of order.

Economic depression exemplifies the lack of a good of order. The good of order provides for a regular and recurrent production and distribution of particular goods. Without the order, particular goods may come, but not regularly or recurrently. This is important because “Man is intelligent; he is not satisfied with breakfast today; he wants lunch and dinner too, and he wants them every day.”²²⁴

The third and final level of the human good is “value.” Particular goods and the good of order are evaluated and criticized as more or less worthwhile based on a society’s values.²²⁵

Each culture will have different particular goods, different goods of order, and different values. But every culture will have *some* particular goods, *some* good of order, and *some* values. Thus, for Lonergan, these three levels constitute an “invariant structure” to the human good.²²⁶ Particular goods are relatively self-explanatory, but let us consider further the good of order and value.

²²⁴ Ibid., 39.

²²⁵ Ibid., 39-40.

²²⁶ Ibid., 33.

In this quote, Lonergan names four aspects of the good of order: “a regular recurrence of particular goods, coordinated human operations, a set of conditions of the operations, and personal status.”²²⁷

First, “a regular recurrence of particular goods,” is not to be achieved by “mechanist planning,” since in a mechanist model the plans must be perfect. They must work out every detail or the whole system will go awry. Instead of comparing the good of order to a machine, Lonergan likens it to the way water circulates on the surface of the earth. Its circulation operates on probabilities more than certainties. Consequently, some parts of the earth are very dry, and some are very wet. Nevertheless, there is a statistical regularity to precipitation in certain geographic areas at given times.²²⁸

Second, in affirming that the good of order is about “coordinated human operations,” Lonergan denies that human development is primarily produced by the unrelated achievements of isolated individuals. Rather, he affirms that most human operation is cooperation. “Coordinated human operations” occur because of an interdependence formed by spontaneous interdependence, love, and the communal bonds of common meaning, value, and purpose. Persons separated by time and space may still influence one another mutually, though indirectly. Such human cooperation is essential to the proper functioning of any human enterprise.²²⁹

Third, for this cooperation to occur there is required “a set of conditions,” including (1) “habits” and “skills” of the heart, mind, and body; (2) “institutions,” which

²²⁷ Ibid., 34.

²²⁸ Ibid., 35.

²²⁹ Ibid.

are like habits on social level—something in society which regularly handles certain sets of operations (schools, courts, etc.);²³⁰ and (3) “material equipment” such as books, desks, pens.

“Personal status,” the fourth aspect of the human good, is produced by the pattern of cooperation in and among institutions. Different people perform different functions and fill different roles. We are who we are as persons in relation to others.

The standard for evaluating, criticizing, and improving both particular goods and the good of order is Lonergan’s third level of the human good, “value.” Just as a society can choose from a variety of products which ones it will produce, there are many possible ways of setting up a society, or goods of order. Commenting on the Cold War, Lonergan writes, “Children fight about particular goods, but men fight about the good of order.” He selects three types or approaches to value: (1) The “aesthetic” approach realizes the true and the good in the sensible. When a good of order is good, its goodness is transparent in its products and in the happiness of its members. (2) The “ethical” approach asks if its members becoming more “autonomous, responsible, free.” (3) The religious approach to value judges all things as when we stand before God, with our neighbor, in the context of history.²³¹ Any given society will have some measure of each.

Lonergan’s basic point in *Topics in Education*, thus, is that the human good is not simply the fulfillment of particular desires but the whole system that includes and provides for the fulfillment of these desires. The particular goods and the whole system

²³⁰ Ibid., 35-36.

²³¹ Ibid., 37-38.

are not value-free. They are the embodiments of a community's judgments of value and decisions.

To present the invariant structure of the human good in *Method*, Lonergan selects eighteen terms divided into three sets: "(1) *individuals* in their *potentialities* and *actuations*, (2) *cooperating groups* [also called *society*], (3) *ends*."²³² What follows is my attempt to relate these eighteen terms among themselves clearly, accurately, and briefly (At their first mention, the eighteen terms are in bold, and their above-mentioned categories are italicized.). *Method*'s main additions to *Topics in Education* are "liberty," "orientation," and "conversion." These I treat at greater length.

Each *individual* has *potentialities*. Basic among these potentialities are **needs** and **capacities** to fulfill the needs. The capacities are *actuated* on an individual level by **operations** that obtain the *ends* of **particular goods**. To a great extent, since we live in cooperating groups, or *society*, the operations are **cooperations**. The capacities for operating are **plastic** and **perfectible** so **skills** can be **developed**. Development is largely in the context of social **institutions**, which also facilitate cooperation by assigning individuals different **roles** with respective **tasks**.

The **good of order** is the sum of these things in a related whole. It is individuals in society developing their plastic and perfectible capacities to operate and cooperate into skills that give them roles and tasks in institutions that provide particular goods. The good of order is not a design for a utopia nor a theoretical ideal nor a set of laws.²³³

²³² *Method*, 47. Emphasis added.

²³³ *Ibid.*, 48-49.

The good of order as a whole and the individuals within it are characterized by a **liberty** that is not indetermination but a self-determinism, experienced by individuals in their choosing and acting. Real liberty is the result of responsible decisions, exercised within **personal relations** that are determined by more or less shared needs, commitments, expectations, experiences, feelings, meanings, and values. **Terminal values** are the values chosen by an “originating value” or an authentic chooser, whose choices create valuable goods, and who personally grows in liberty with each choice and realization of true value. These originators of value, these self-transcendent people, can themselves be terminal values.²³⁴

By their choice of terminal values, exercised in liberty, individuals and societies **orient** themselves and shape the direction of their development. As individuals or social groups, people may also choose to change the direction of their development or their orientation. **Conversion** is a positive change in orientation. It frees one from inauthenticity for greater authenticity. Conversion causes a radical shift in one’s fears and desires, satisfactions and values, beliefs and scales of preference.²³⁵

I end this discussion of the human good by returning to *Topics in Education*, because it contains Lonergan’s strongest presentation of the human good as it develops. In the second chapter of *Topics*, Lonergan discusses the development of the human good on two levels: civilization and culture. “Intellectual development corresponds to civilization, reflective development to culture.” Lonergan analyses the development of

²³⁴ Ibid., 50-51

²³⁵ Ibid., 51-52. Conversion is treated at length in Chapter 3 of this dissertation.

civilization along the lines of technology, economy, and polity.²³⁶ Civilization is driven by ideas, while culture is driven by values. Culture stands above civilization as values stand above the good of order. In other words, culture provides the standards for evaluating and critiquing a civilization. It provides the “aims and values” by which one may judge the ideas embodied in a civilization.²³⁷

The mutual development of civilization and culture follows a pattern of “Challenge-and-Response” that Lonergan learned from Toynbee.²³⁸ Basically this means that challenges arise in a human community. The challenges invite responses by members of the community, and the responses create new challenges that again call for new responses, and so forth. This is the same process as *Insight*’s self-correcting process of learning and *Method*’s transcendental method.

Revealing the interdependence of the human good in a world order of emergent probability, Lonergan notes that the process of challenge and response may start small, with a single insight in response to a minor, localized problem, but swiftly it

will involve repercussions all through the good of order. New ideas will start popping up everywhere. There will result augmented well-being, and it affects each of the aspects of the human good: the flow of particular goods becomes more frequent, more intense, more varied; new equipment is produced; institutions are remodeled; new types of goods are provided; the society enjoys more democracy and more education; new habits are formed to deal with the new equipment in the new institutions; there is status for all, because everything is running smoothly; everybody is too busy to be bothered with knifing other people; there are happy personal relations, a development in taste, in aesthetic value and its appreciation, and in ethics, in the autonomy of the subject; finally, there is more time for people to attend to their own perfection in religion.²³⁹

²³⁶ *Topics in Education*, 55. Cf., *Insight*, Ch. 7.

²³⁷ *Topics in Education*, 50.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, 51, with note to Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, vol. 3: *The Growth of Civilizations* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934); index, Challenge-and-Response. See also *Insight*, 234.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*

The agents of this change are “creative personalities.” And while small changes can spread quickly, for sustained progress to occur, there needs to be a whole succession of these personalities “who are not simply sunk into the existing situation, immersed in its routines, and functioning like cogs in a wheel, with little grasp of possibilities, with a lack of daring.”²⁴⁰

To be creative, such personalities must withdraw from society and become detached, at least mentally, in order to see how things could be different, to “become themselves.” This withdrawal is not permanent but for the sake of a return, for transforming the world. Lonergan notes that Karl Marx, perhaps the most influential person of the twentieth century, spent years alone writing in the British Museum.²⁴¹

These creative types must also be prepared to struggle. Toynbee assesses four steps in a difficult process of social adaptation to creative ideas: (1) enthusiasm, led by poets, (2) sedation, when systematizers take over, (3) disillusion, with conflicts caused by change, and (4) general acceptance, when “the prophets are honored by the sons of those who had stoned them.” Ideas slowly spread by imitation. Toynbee calls this *mimesis*, and it involves charmed followers who feel something is afoot but need a leader to provide direction, hierarchy, law, loyalty.²⁴²

A major aspect of the difficulty faced by the creative class involves a change in culture. Along with changes in the technological, economic, and political structures of a civilization, and in addition to changes in the particular goods, the good of order, and the

²⁴⁰ Ibid. , 51-52. For more on the need for change, particularly within the context of the church and classicism, see “Existenz and Aggiornamento,” especially, 247-49.

²⁴¹ *Topics in Education*, 52. Toynbee writes of both “withdrawal for return” and a “creative minority.”

²⁴² Ibid. Lonergan does not provide citations for this and the above ideas.

concrete ways of realizing value, there must be a concomitant change in the public's apprehension, reflection upon, and expression of those changes in symbols, customs, laws, stories, and traditional wisdom.

As a culture develops, so too do its tools for reflection. In *Topics in Education* Lonergan discusses this as progress "from the compactness of the symbol to the differentiation of philosophic, scientific, theological, and historical consciousness."²⁴³ Thus, a very important part of progress occurs within human consciousness, as a "differentiation" of consciousness. Lonergan's account of four differentiations of consciousness constitutes our final section in this chapter on progress.

1.5.4. Realms of Meaning

The "realms of meaning" are communal developments on a level of culture. They arise when any group of people develops its own technical language, its own distinct methods for gaining and sharing knowledge, and perhaps even its own formal cultural, social, or professional organizations.²⁴⁴

Lonergan typically counts four "basic" realms of meaning, leaving the possibility open for more.²⁴⁵ These realms are historical developments that emerged in different time periods (at least the first three realms). Today, a particular culture or a particular person may be "fluent" in one or more of the realms of meaning. When a person becomes fluent in more than one realm, her/his consciousness becomes "differentiated." Lonergan calls the ground within consciousness for each fluency a "differentiation of

²⁴³ Ibid., 55.

²⁴⁴ *Method*, 81-85, 257-262.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 272. Here Lonergan adds a realm of "art," focused on beauty, and a realm of "scholarship," which aims at the meaning of words and the intentions of deeds.

consciousness.” He enumerates at least thirty-one possible combinations of differentiated consciousness, plus one undifferentiated consciousness (a consciousness restricted to the most basic realm).²⁴⁶

The first and most basic realm of meaning is *common sense*. One’s entry into common sense is one’s entry into the world mediated by meaning: language.²⁴⁷ We have discussed common sense as a set of insights, meanings, and values, which considers things in relation to ourselves or our group, and which aims at providing practical knowledge for everyday living.

We have also already considered the second realm, *theory*, and this in terms of the scientist’s quest for knowledge that moves from description to explanation, and from things as they are related to us and our senses, to things as they are related to each other. Common sense extends back to time immemorial. But theory, at least in Western civilization, seems to have developed with what Lonergan, following Bruno Snell, calls “the Greek discovery of the Mind.”²⁴⁸ Theory develops when questions arise from real or apparent contradictions in a culture’s myths.²⁴⁹ Parmenides is key figure in the development of theory, because he challenged sense evidence, and therefore established a

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., 86-90.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 90, citing Bruno Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind* (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1960), chs. 1, 3, 5, 9. Lonergan writes that as *stages* of meaning they are “ideal constructs,” and that “in the main” he has “in mind the Western tradition” (*Method*, 85).

²⁴⁹ *Method*, 89-91. For Lonergan this is true of the development of Christian theology. In one’s reading of scripture, questions arise which scripture itself does not answer. Lonergan traces the development of one such question, If there is one God and the Father is God, then what is the Son? This is the subject of Lonergan’s work, *The Way to Nicea* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976).

distinction between sense and intellect. Furthermore, the thrust to theory is well exemplified in Socrates' search for universal definitions.²⁵⁰

Lonergan distinguishes between two stages within the realm of theory. In the first stage, philosophers represent the paradigm for theory, so all academic thinkers, including scientists, seek logical control over meaning.²⁵¹ In this stage, classical law reigns. But in the second stage of theory, the natural sciences are given an independence from philosophy, and developments such as statistical law emerge.²⁵² Both stages within theory give rise to the pursuit of wisdom and culture *for its own sake* in what Lonergan, following Marx, calls a society's "superstructure," namely its schools, libraries, research institutions, etc. Commonly, some members of society may think such developments are useless, but they are for enrichment of mind, the ennobling of will, and many other unforeseen purposes.²⁵³

The third realm of meaning, *interiority*, is developed from questions raised by conflicts between common sense and theory: Is common sense simply "primitive ignorance" while science is the "dawn"? How does one really come to know?²⁵⁴ In Western culture, the rise of interiority began in the Enlightenment, with the slow replacement of faculty psychology by intentionality analysis through the advance of such thinkers as Galileo, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, Kierkegaard, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Blondel, the pragmatists, Brentano and Husserl.²⁵⁵ Though he would

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 82, 92.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 85.

²⁵² As discussed above, in section 1.2.2.

²⁵³ *Topics*, 75-76.

²⁵⁴ *Method*, 83.

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 96.

generally not agree with their answers, Lonergan would credit them with raising the right questions. Lonergan believes that interiority is becoming dominant in culture today as the influence of the classicism of an early stage within theory diminishes.²⁵⁶ This is the realm of meaning Lonergan calls us to in *Insight* and *Method*. While interiority arises from questions about how one comes to know its domain extends to questions about decision-making, loving, and the relationships among knowing, deciding, and loving. What is love? How does one know one is in love? Does love cloud or aid one's objectivity? "As always, enlightenment is a matter of the ancient precept, Know thyself."²⁵⁷

The fourth basic realm of meaning, *transcendence*, regards unrestricted intelligibility, absolute truth, the value beyond criticism, and unconditional love. It is "the realm in which God is known and loved" reached in "religiously differentiated consciousness."²⁵⁸ Not limited to some future stage, and not restricted to Christian mystics, Lonergan finds that Teresa of Avila and mystics from other religions cohabit this realm.

While society has exhibited a progression from the simple, undifferentiated consciousness of common sense to a differentiated consciousness that includes all four realms of meaning, individuals within that society may remain content in an undifferentiated common sense both marveling at and mocking scientists, academics, poets, artists, and saints.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

²⁵⁷ "Natural Right and Historical Mindedness," 279. This essay discusses the three historical "stages" as "plateaus," 277-279.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 272.

Conclusion

This ends the chapter's presentation of Lonergan's very complicated but very enriching thought on what drives human progress. For Lonergan, progress is a more or less abstract notion. He affirms that in concrete reality human beings do make real progress. But theoretically, Lonergan studies progress in a particular way: as it flows from human persons and human society to the extent that as we are strictly "natural," in other words prescinding from both the negative effects of sin, which cause decline, and the positive effects of grace, from which flows redemption. For Lonergan, this "nature" that drives progress is (1) historical, (2) part of a dynamic world order of emergent probability, (3) driven by intelligence (4) self-transcendent in a larger experiential, intellectual, reasonable, and responsible authenticity, (5) comprised of common life in community bound by shared meaning, value, and love, and (6) productive, through cooperation, of a developing human good.

Lonergan's views on nature and progress are very complicated, still, they comprise just one of three factors or differentials operative in Lonergan's analysis of the concrete human situation. In the next chapter, we will consider Lonergan's thought on the second differential, namely the decline caused by sin.

Chapter 2. Decline: Nature as Fallen

One of the biggest mistakes of early proponents of progress, according to Lonergan, was their utopian view that progress in human affairs was automatic and unbroken.²⁵⁹ They failed to account for the role of sin and evil. Early liberals were aware of sin, but they held the illusion that individual egoism was the sufficient engine for progress.²⁶⁰ Along with modernity's many contributions to the natural and human sciences came an arrogance that viewed human intelligence, reasonableness and responsibility as sufficient for progress and human sin as what really makes one oneself.²⁶¹

Progress, as one vector in the analysis of human history, is Lonergan's transposition of the classical, static category of "nature" into a dynamic, historical context. But in reality no person and no society is ever in a pure state of nature. We are all affected by what Christian tradition calls "the Fall,"²⁶² "original sin"²⁶³ and the

²⁵⁹ *Insight*, 264, 710-11; *Topics in Education*, 47.

²⁶⁰ See note 7, above.

²⁶¹ *Esistenz and Aggiornamento*, 247.

²⁶² "Openness and Religious Experience," 200.

²⁶³ "Healing and Creating in History," 101-02. Lonergan does not discuss original sin by name in any great detail. He would probably reject traditional metaphors for original sin such as the "stain" of original sin. Instead, he Lonergan seems to address original sin when discussing the influence of a society in decline or a "sinful social process" on its members. For example, in *Method*, 117, he writes, "Decline disrupts a culture with conflicting ideologies. It inflicts on individuals the social, economic, and psychological pressures that for human frailty amount to determinism. It multiplies and heaps up the abuses and absurdities that breed resentment, hatred, anger, violence."

resultant “darkening of intellect and weakening of will.”²⁶⁴ The human person as concretely alive in this world is a composite, more or less affected by both the intrinsic goodness of nature and the inherent evil of sin. The result is that we are, as Pascal observes, both “wretched and great.”²⁶⁵ In Lonergan’s terms, human history is always a mixed product of nature and sin, progress and decline.

Decline is Lonergan’s term for sin’s cumulative effect on human history. It is why our world does not function in a rosy, continuous succession of improvement upon improvement. Because of decline, we remain intelligent and free, rational and loving, but in potential more than in truth.²⁶⁶ Decline flows from our real failure to observe the transcendental precepts, our failure to be authentic in individual operations and social cooperation. As progress depends on our being attentive, intelligent, reasonable and responsible, decline is the result of “inattention, obtuseness, unreasonableness, irresponsibility,” and as progress was a series of insights improving the human situation, so decline causes successive “objectively absurd situations.”²⁶⁷

Decline is the result of a perversion of the natural, unrestricted desire for beauty, meaning, truth, value, goodness, and love, i.e., our longing for God. Sinful acts suppress this desire. Over time they form multiple biases that shrink one’s natural orientation to

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 102; cf., *Grace and Freedom*, 16. On the universality of sin and its effects, Lonergan cites Rom. 1:18-3:20; 7:14-24; Eph. 2:3 (“Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness,” 8).

²⁶⁵ Blaise Pascal, *Pensées*, trans. A.J. Krailheimer (London: Penguin. This is a recurrent theme in the *Pensées*, but it is the focus of I, 7. Similarly, though with an understanding of goodness that was confined strictly to grace, Luther wrote the phrase “simultaneously justified and sinner” (*simul justus et peccator*) in the margin of his Bible. The theme is expressed in his *On Christian Liberty* as “free lord” and “dutiful servant.” Martin Luther, *On Christian Liberty*, trans W. A. Lambert (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress), 2.

²⁶⁶ Lonergan comments that because of sin, we are rational animals only in potency. In reality, he believes, we are more symbolic animals than rational animals, since symbols affect both saints and sinners (*Topics*, 79-80).

²⁶⁷ *Method*, 54-55.

truth and goodness, to beauty and love. In turn, these biases increase the probability of future sins, and thus produce a downward spiral of sin and bias, in a word, decline.

In this chapter we examine decline in three parts: (1) the more traditional cause of decline: sin, (2) the mutual effect and cause of sin in human consciousness: bias, and (3) the result of sin and bias in history: decline.

2.1. Sin and Evil

According to the older, scholastic theories expressed in terms of faculty psychology, original sin and personal sin cause a “darkening of intellect and weakening of will.”²⁶⁸ Sin and evil enter into the world through free human acts. To the degree that we do good, we are God’s instruments, but when we do evil, we are the sole initiators of the act. Following Thomas Aquinas, Lonergan affirms that God is the sole creator and the ultimate sustainer of all that exists and of all that is good. Directly, God wills only what is good. Among the goods that God wills are the free wills of human persons. In willing the good of free will, God allows or permits the evil of sin, but in no way does God will it.²⁶⁹

In *Insight*, Lonergan distinguishes “basic sin” from “moral evil” and “physical evil.” Basic sin is a failure of the intellect and the will, respectively, to identify rationally and to choose morally the good. Lonergan emphasizes the negative aspect basic sin by

²⁶⁸ See note 264, above.

²⁶⁹ “Moral Theology and the Human Sciences,” *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 304. Lonergan cites Thomas’s *Summa Theologica*, 1, q. 19, a. 9 c., and ad 3m. See also *Insight*, 688-90. The relationship between God and evil will be covered more thoroughly in the next chapter.

calling it not simply a failure *of* the will but a failure *to will*. Similarly, sin is not only a failure of the intellect and reason; it is *unintelligible* and *irrational* in itself.²⁷⁰

If there were a reason it would not be sin. There may be excuses; there may be extenuating circumstances, but there cannot be a reason, for basic sin consists, not in yielding to reasons and reasonableness, but in failing to yield to them; it consists not in inadvertent failure but in advertence to and in acknowledgment of obligation that nonetheless is not followed by reasonable response.²⁷¹

Basic sin includes an unreasonable “contraction of consciousness” as well as some derivative unreasonable, wrong action. “Moral evil” is Lonergan’s term for such wrong actions. Moral evil is any result or “consequence” of basic sin. Such consequences include damage done to the sinner and to the social situation. Basic sin and the moral evil they cause increase the probability that future sins and evils will occur. They do this by heightening the “tension and temptation in oneself or in one’s social milieu.”²⁷² As scripture asserts, it is through sin that suffering and death enter the world.²⁷³

Moral evil is to be distinguished from “natural evil,” which includes such occurrences as natural disasters and birth defects. Natural or “physical” evils are in no way caused by sin, but rather constitute “all the shortcomings of a world order that consists, insofar as we understand it, in a generalized emergent probability.”²⁷⁴ The universe is developing from lower to higher material and biological and spiritual forms. This development is not a matter of fixed determinism but of risk. From a limited

²⁷⁰ *Insight*, 689-90.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 690.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, 689.

²⁷³ “Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness,” 8. Lonergan cites Gen 2:15; 3:19; Rom. 5:12; 6:22-23.

²⁷⁴ *Insight*, 689.

perspective, hurricanes, illnesses, and the like are evil. But from the point of view of the entire world order, they can be seen as tending to the good. In fact, even moral evil (the consequence of sin), which is indirectly willed by God in the creation of a just world order, can be viewed in this way. “For the imperfection of the lower is the potentiality for the higher; the underdeveloped is for the developed; and even moral evils through the dialectical tension they generate head either to their own elimination or to a reinforcement of the moral good.”²⁷⁵

In *Topics in Education*, Lonergan identifies sin as the cause of decline. He examines sin and its effects as “crime,” in “social process,” and as “aberration.”

Considered as *crime*, sin can be studied statistically and may be dealt with mainly by laws, police, courts, and prisons. The law is a fundamental instrument for apprehending good and evil. “As St. Paul says in Romans 3.20, ‘Through the law there is knowledge of sin.’ And again in Romans 5.13 he writes, ‘Before the law there was sin in the world, but the sin was not counted as sin since there was no law.’” As a kind of crime, sin is done by people who do not understand the social network and/or who do not wish to be a part of it, people whom society has failed to bring up in its ways or those who refuse to live by society’s ways. Viewing sin as a crime makes sin clear, however, the great disadvantage of this approach is its minimal standard for the good. The good has no real positive value. It becomes merely not breaking the law or perhaps even not getting caught.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 691.

²⁷⁶ *Topics in Education*, 59. It would seem that another disadvantage to viewing sin as a crime is the individualization of sin. A court of law must hold some individual or group of individuals responsible. Original sin, however, adds a social component that falls under social process and decline. Lonergan does

Due to these shortcomings, it is best to supplement this view with an understanding of sin as a component in a *social process*. Reminding us that the good of order does not in fact develop in the “glorious fashion” he outlined in his discussion of progress, Lonergan writes that the good of order:

develops under a bias in favor of the powerful, the rich, or the most numerous class. It changes the creative minority into a merely dominant minority. It leads to a division of classes not merely by their function, but also by their well-being. This division of classes gives rise in the underdogs to suspicion, envy, resentment, hatred, and in those that have the better end of the stick, to haughtiness, arrogance, disdain, criticism of ‘sloth,’ of ‘lack of initiative,’ of ‘short-sightedness,’ or in earlier times, of ‘lowly birth.’²⁷⁷

So in the world process, sin introduces biases in favor of some types of people against other types. To the extent that these biases are operative in society, it is not enough to have good ideas and to work hard. One must have some measure of wealth, power, and popular opinion if one’s ideas are to be realized. Management seeks ever more power because it desires control. Bureaucratic hierarchies arise. Eventually, the only ideas that have a chance of success are those that come from the people at the top.

In a better world, good ideas could come from anywhere and still be effective. They could come from “the man on the spot who is intelligent, sees the possibilities, and goes ahead at his own risk. But in the bureaucracy the intelligent man ceases to be the initiator.... Activity is slowed down to the pace of routine paperwork. Style and form, that are inevitable when the man who has the idea is running things, yield to standardization and uniformity.”²⁷⁸ Small, independent businesses are taken over or

not state this weakness of considering sin as a crime, but it may have been at least part of the reason for his addition of sin as part of the social process.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 60. Sin as social process seems to me to be the closest Lonergan gets to the traditional doctrine of “original sin.” See note 263.

²⁷⁸ Ibid., 60-61.

forced to close. “You have to be in big business to be in business at all, and in big business you have nothing to say.”²⁷⁹ Work becomes drudgery. People seek distraction in frivolity. The universities become ivory towers, with no concern for the actual situation.

Lonergan finds that many attempts to improve the social situation end up perpetuating or increasing the damage. One such attempt is archaism, or a return to ancient virtues, even when the ancient virtues are no longer relevant. Another is futurism, the expectation that utopia will come in some leap, probably through technology. Alternatively, the state may create “‘times of troubles,’ wars to arouse social concern, to give people a stake in the nation, to give them the feeling that they belong together in one nation.”²⁸⁰ Any of these, for Lonergan, perpetuate sin as a “social process.”

Finally, sin may be considered as *aberration*, as an evil opposed to the reflective development of the individual and the broader culture. For Lonergan, an aberration is oriented to a negative outcome. This is true for both the individual’s consciousness and the society’s cultural history. “As aberrant [individual] consciousness heads to neurosis and psychosis, similarly aberrant [social] history heads to cataclysm.”²⁸¹ Ideally, both persons and communities are oriented to the totality of the true and the good. But the aberration of sin shrinks human concern, blocking off important ideas, questions, and

²⁷⁹ Ibid., 61.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., 61-62.

²⁸¹ Ibid., 63.

aspects of experience. It closes off “the higher aspirations of the human spirit and the human heart.”²⁸²

In advanced civilizations, the higher aspects of culture (art, literature, philosophy, religion) function as arenas to work out the natural human unrestricted desire for beauty, truth, and goodness. However, the “chain reactions”²⁸³ of sin transform high culture into “a high-level rationalization” for society’s sins. In response to the evils of a culture in decline, virtuous observers may be tempted to wholesale condemnation, but Lonergan warns that this is not the best response: “the Catholic may wish to retire to an ivory tower, to condemn the new good because of its association with new evils; but that is another form of the aberration.”²⁸⁴

Not just culture, but the whole human good is affected. As there are particular goods, a good of order, and the values by which particular goods and a good of order may be judged, so too there are particular evils, an organization of evil, and a negation of value. Particular evils include personal privations, suffering, harm, and destruction. Organized evils include chronic schemes of recurrence, such as crime waves, depressions, and war. These organized evils are evil schemes of recurrence. Just as in a good of order, people involved in a cycle of evil can gain skills and habits to do what is evil. They can cooperate in it, set up institutions for it. “There can be the destruction of personal relations and status through hatred, envy, jealousy, lust, resentment, grievance.

²⁸² Ibid.

²⁸³ Ibid., 67.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., 64-65.

People with grievances, nations with grievances, very easily can become warped in their entire outlook.”²⁸⁵

On top of particular evils and their recurrent scheme, there is a “negation of value.” Aesthetically, particular goods become dysfunctional and ugly. The good of order becomes either too complex to be transparent or so loose it exists in name only. Ethically, the liberty that flourishes in a good of order becomes perverted into “a reign of sin, a despotism of darkness” that makes all men its slaves.²⁸⁶ The freedom of humanity that is “essential” to its nature becomes less and less an “effective” reality.²⁸⁷ If there is an order, it is mechanical. Most individuals become “drifters,” conforming. Some become

the complementary type with the will to power, social engineers, the hidden persuaders, who dominate the drifting masses... [who] are controlled without their knowing it – the propaganda ministry of the totalitarian state. And there can be its equivalent in the advertising setup, big institutions for control of people’s choices without their knowing it.²⁸⁸

Against religious value are the evils of “estrangement from God, secularism, the negation of the idea of sin, complete and full self-assertion.” Social thinking becomes dominated by “vast illusions,” such as automatic progress, utopias, supermen, the illusion of the individual, and scientism. People neither “fear God” nor “respect man.”²⁸⁹

Finally, there is a “theological dimension” to sin and its consequent particular evils, evil schemes of recurrence and negation of value. Sin is not merely an intentional failure to observe the natural desires of the human person and the natural patterns of the

²⁸⁵ *Topics in Education*, 43-44.

²⁸⁶ *Insight*, 714.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 715. On effective and essential freedom, see section 1.4.1.4., above.

²⁸⁸ *Topics in Education*, 46.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 46-47.

social order, sin is also a “revolt against God, an abuse of his goodness and love, a pragmatic calumny that hides from oneself and from others the absolute goodness and perfect love that through the universe and through men expresses itself to men.”²⁹⁰ Sin is a rejection of the wise, divinely-willed order of the universe as well as of humanity’s role of “cooperation with God in the realization of the order of the universe.”²⁹¹ Tradition distinguishes between venial and mortal sin with mortal sin being a deadly blow, a total rupture of the sinner’s relationship with God, or as contemporary moral theologians might say, a “fundamental option” against God.²⁹²

In *Method*, Lonergan does not focus on sin, but rather on the proper performance of conscious intentionality in right relationship with God and all things. In this context, however, I believe it safe to say that sin is a failure of conscious intentionality to be authentically self-transcendent in one’s experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding. It comes from and causes improper relationality. Ultimately, “sinfulness... is the privation of total loving; it is a radical dimension of lovelessness”²⁹³ or perhaps even a “love of evil.”²⁹⁴ Because by nature we humans desire unrestricted love and the lasting peace that only such love can bring, sin leads us to engage in

sustained superficiality, by evading ultimate questions, by absorption in all that the world offers to challenge our resourcefulness, to relax our bodies, to distract our minds. But escape may not be permanent and then the absence of fulfillment reveals itself in unrest, the absence of joy in the pursuit of fun, the absence of peace in disgust—a depressive disgust with oneself or a manic, hostile, even violent disgust with mankind.²⁹⁵

²⁹⁰ *Insight*, 722.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 714.

²⁹² “Philosophy of God, and Theology. Lecture 2: The Functional Specialty ‘Systematics’” a lecture given at St. Michael’s Institute, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington, 1972, published in *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 197.

²⁹³ *Method*, 242-43.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 40.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 243.

Along with this disgust comes *alienation*, on which Lonergan writes briefly: “Sin is alienation from man’s authentic being, which is self-transcendence, and sin justifies itself by ideology.”²⁹⁶ Alienation, in the context of transcendental method, is a disregard of the transcendental precepts—the opposite of authenticity. Concretely, it results in decline.²⁹⁷

In a public lecture, a year after *Method*’s publication, Lonergan summarizes the above aspects of sin, defining it simply, as “a turning against yourself, and against God, and against your neighbor.”²⁹⁸

2.2. Bias

Sin and evil are categories traditional to Catholic theology, even if Lonergan’s analysis of them is his own. Bias is more original to Lonergan. It is an inauthentic orientation caused by and causal of inauthentic actions, decisions, judgments, ideas, and experiences. It is both the result of sin and a cause of further sin.²⁹⁹ As such, bias functions in a way similar to Aristotle’s bad habits, or vices.³⁰⁰ However, while Aristotle discusses vice as an extreme on either side of a “golden mean,” Lonergan analyses bias in terms of conscious intentionality, social dynamics, and history. Sinful personal judgments of value, decisions, and actions damage the social and historical situation. Such actions and situations cause the hardening of bias, which is the shrinking of one’s

²⁹⁶ Ibid., 364. More on alienation and ideology will follow in our discussion of decline, below.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 55.

²⁹⁸ “Philosophy of God, and Theology. Lecture 2: The Functional Specialty ‘Systematics,’” 8. Full reference above.

²⁹⁹ *Topics in Education*, 60.

³⁰⁰ See Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bks. 2, 4, 7. My hunch is that in Aristotle’s terms Lonergan’s bias would be something like an intellegual vice (negative habit) with harmful moral implications.

horizon of concern, a harmful, habitual orientation of the heart and the mind. This shrinking of horizon, this harmful habit of the heart and mind corrupts a person's or a community's decisions, judgments, understandings, and experiences.³⁰¹

Let us examine in greater detail the four biases that Lonergan identifies: dramatic, individual, group, and general.

2.2.1. Dramatic Bias

Dramatic bias operates largely on a subconscious basis. It negatively affects the psychic activity of the person, which controls the underlying physical, chemical, and biological schemes of recurrence, and which sets the conditions for the emergence of higher level functions of consciousness: experiencing, questioning, understanding, judging, and deciding.

Even in the ideal authentic person, experience is patterned by “interest, anticipation, and activity.”³⁰² For example, all of one's conscious operations can be geared toward fulfilling biological needs, such as getting food to live, or escaping possible death. A person could be attending to the beauty of the world and experiencing for the sake of experiencing, as do hikers or children at play. Like Archimedes, all of one's consciousness could be focused on getting an insight, on figuring out a problem. In general, however, people are engaged in the general task of living. This task takes up the biological, aesthetic, and intellectual concerns and brings them into a richer context of crafting the drama of one's own life. In this “dramatic pattern of experience,” food, art,

³⁰¹ *Method*, 231. Notice the movement “from above downwards,” similar to how genuine love and its horizons and habits shape a person or community's decisions, judgments, understandings, and experiences. See section 1.5.2.

³⁰² *Ibid.*, 210.

and insight get taken up into larger contexts of meaning. “[C]lothes are not a simple-minded matter of keeping warm. They are the colored plumes of birds as well as the furs of animals. They disguise as well as cover and adorn.”³⁰³

In the dramatic pattern of experience by which we live our lives, higher mental functions “reach down” into the neural processes that set the preconscious conditions for conscious operations. All conscious operations have counterparts in preconscious neural functions. There is a preconscious operator that Freud calls a “censor,” which does the “selection and arrangement,” and thus the “rejection and exclusion” of both sensitive and affective experience.³⁰⁴ Normally, the censor functions in a positive, constructive manner by raising helpful schemes of images and feelings. In the person who seeks genuine insight into the drama of living, the censor is neutral to whatever insight may arise from the question’s interaction with the scheme.

However, “[j]ust as insight can be desired, so too it can be unwanted. Besides the love of light, there can be a love of darkness.”³⁰⁵ This, Lonergan calls a “flight from understanding,”³⁰⁶ caused by the natural human desire to have one’s choices to be in harmony with one’s knowledge of reality. To avoid the uneasy conscience that arises from the dissonance between reality and sinful choice, one may tell oneself more or less conscious lies, i.e., one may rationalize.³⁰⁷ However, one may also have formed a fundamental, unconscious bias, the “dramatic bias.”

³⁰³ Ibid. For more on such patterns of experience, see *Insight*, 204-212; *Method*, 286. To the biological, aesthetic, intellectual, and dramatic patterns of *Insight*, *Method* adds the mystical or worshipful.

³⁰⁴ *Insight*, 214.

³⁰⁵ Ibid.

³⁰⁶ *Insight*, 5, 220-223.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 215; cf., 264-65, 621-23. See the above section on authenticity.

If a person has a dramatic bias, the censor's positive function becomes primarily repressive. "Just as wanting an insight penetrates below the surface to bring forth schematic images that give rise to the insight, so not wanting an insight has the opposite effect of repressing from consciousness a scheme that would suggest the insight."³⁰⁸ Perverted by dramatic bias, the censor represses insight by inhibiting neural demand functions that allow needed images and feelings to arise. Feelings may arise, but only when they have been detached from their proper image or insight. They then arise attached to some incongruous object that may be more or less associated with the original object. Blocking an insight causes a "blind spot" or "scotoma," in one's understanding.³⁰⁹

The repression of just one insight can have far-reaching effects, as Lonergan explains:

To exclude an insight is also to exclude the further questions that would arise from it, and the complementary insights that would carry it towards a rounded and balanced viewpoint. To lack that fuller view results in behavior that generates misunderstanding both in ourselves and in others. To suffer such incomprehension favors a withdrawal from the outer drama of human living into the inner drama of fantasy.³¹⁰

Dramatic bias fosters an introversion contrary to a human person's natural extroversion on biological, aesthetic, intellectual, and social levels. The person is no longer at home in the real world, and so s/he must generate "a differentiation of the persona that appears before others and the more intimate ego."³¹¹ Individuals may seek release from division of the persona and the ego in certain dreams, in therapy, or in the

³⁰⁸ Ibid., 216; cf., "Moral Theology and the Human Sciences," 305-06.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 215.

³¹⁰ Ibid., 214

³¹¹ Ibid., 214.

“mass therapy” and “catharsis” of theater, of totems and taboos. In any case, a cure will require insight.³¹² Though associated with very serious neuroses and psychoses, Lonergan reminds us that dramatic bias is common to all people and elementary to all our sins.³¹³

2.2.2. *Individual Bias: Egoism*

Egoism is generally acknowledged as a negative bias. However, identifying exactly what it is, is difficult. Egoism is not an animal hunting down its prey, just as altruism is not the animal parent fostering its young. Both of these acts are instinctual rather than deliberate. This distinction extends to some human behavior. Egoism is not simply the spontaneous desire to satisfy one’s own appetites, and altruism is not simply the tendency of spontaneous intersubjectivity to help others to gain their satisfactions.³¹⁴

Furthermore, egoism is not the same as self-love, at least not genuine self-love. Aristotle brings this to light in his *Nicomachean Ethics*. True friendship excludes self-love in its popular sense, namely egoism. However, to be a good friend to another one must have genuine love for oneself. If one loves oneself rightly, one seeks the best things for oneself. Since virtue and wisdom are the best things, a genuine self-love will seek wisdom and virtue, and these things are prerequisite for being a true friend to oneself and to others. Thus, a true self-love can lead to true friendship. Since love of self and love for others are intertwined, egoism and altruism are not ultimate categories. However, as

³¹² Ibid., 217-227.

³¹³ Ibid., 214.

³¹⁴ Ibid., 244.

Lonergan writes, egoism is in some sense always wrong and altruism is “its proper corrective.”³¹⁵

To explain egoism, Lonergan returns to his distinction between human sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity and common sense. Human living is the result of a dialectical development of common sense and sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity. Egoism is caused by an overemphasis on spontaneity to the point where it interferes with the development of common sense and other forms of intelligence. Egoism is a failure to ask if one’s actions are capable of being generalized and if they are compatible with the social, human good. This overemphasis on spontaneity does not come with the destruction of common sense or of intelligence in general. For an egoist may also be “the cool schemer, the shrewd calculator, the hardheaded self-seeker.” Such an egoist is adept at instrumentalizing intelligence for his or her purposes. Thus, egoism is to some degree intelligent, though it operates with an incomplete development of intelligence.³¹⁶

This incompleteness comes from a perversion of the detached and disinterested desire to know. Egoism brushes aside the “further pertinent questions” that would cast doubt on its selfish acts. “[I]t fails to pivot from the initial and preliminary motivation provided by desires and fears to the self-abnegation involved in allowing complete free play to intelligent inquiry.”³¹⁷ Questions about fairness or the effects of one’s action on

³¹⁵ Ibid., 244, citing Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, IX, 8. The editors note that this text of Aristotle is discussed at greater length in “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 16-17. Christian love commands imply this as well, as we shall see in the section on redemption.

³¹⁶ Ibid., 245.

³¹⁷ Ibid., 245-46. The role of “further pertinent questions” was explained in section 1.4.1.3.

the group are dismissed or are answered improperly, in a way that creates further difficult questions that again are brushed aside.

Like dramatic bias, individual bias causes an aberration in one's understanding. It contradicts the wisdom of common-sense proverbs like, "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." It rejects the golden rule. A common rationalization protests that each person and each situation is different. Lonergan acknowledges these differences, and he concedes that common sense is incomplete without further insights into a situation's unique circumstances. But he insists that although persons and situations have their particularities, they are not completely different:

[I]t does not follow that the golden rule is that there is no golden rule. For the old rule did not advocate identical behavior in significantly different situations; on the contrary, it contended that the mere interchange of individual roles would not by itself constitute a significant difference in concrete situations.³¹⁸

The egoist "devotes his energies to sizing up the social order, ferreting out its weak points and its loopholes, and discovering devices that give access to its rewards while evading its demands for proportionate contributions."³¹⁹ Contrary to some early modern thinkers, such as Thomas Hobbes, Lonergan maintains that egoism is not spontaneous. Rather, it has to overcome systematically the fellow-feeling of spontaneous intersubjectivity and the spontaneous questions of the natural desire to know.

Unlike dramatic bias, individual bias operates on a more conscious level, and the egoist is aware of her or his self-deception to some degree:

The egoist's uneasy conscience is his awareness of his sin against the light. Operative within him there is the eros of the mind, the desire and drive to understand. He knows its value, for he gives it free reign where his own interests are concerned; yet he also

³¹⁸ Ibid., 246.

³¹⁹ Ibid.

repudiates its mastery, for he will not grant serious consideration to its further questions.³²⁰

2.2.3. *Group Bias: Group Egoism*

Group bias, like individual bias, involves an incomplete development of common sense. It too includes a disregard for further questions about the world and one's actions, forgetting the reciprocity implied by the golden rule. "But while individual bias has to overcome normative intersubjective feeling, group bias finds itself supported by such feeling. Again, while individual bias leads to attitudes that conflict with ordinary common sense, group bias operates in the very genesis of commonsense views."³²¹

The community as a whole has a common sense, but each subgroup within a community has its own additional, particular common sense that comes from "the situations with which it immediately deals."³²² There are many healthy forms of communal bonds, but as an aberration of common sense, group bias creates "a loyalty to one's own group matched by a hostility to other groups."³²³

Lonergan devotes special attention to social classes. He does not find their mere existence to be bad necessarily. Ideally, these groups arise from and are distinguished by their roles in the many interrelated schemes of recurrence that underlie the production of a community's technology, the economic distribution of its goods and services, and the political arenas of deliberation and decision. So, for example, research scientists are distinguished from technicians, foremen from managers, and judges from lawyers. If group bias arises, however, one group may manipulate the social order for its own good

³²⁰ Ibid., 247. On essential and effective freedom, see section 1.4.1.4., above.

³²¹ Ibid.

³²² *Insight*, 248.

³²³ *Method*, 53.

to the detriment of others. “Classes become distinguished, not merely by social function, but also by social success,”³²⁴ and that success is obtained at the expense of others. The “body social” becomes divided into “those who have and those who have not.”³²⁵ Such a situation is not healthy for the common, human good.

In Lonergan’s opinion, times of great change (caused by new material conditions and/or transformative ideas) set fertile conditions for the genesis and the hardening of group bias. Sometimes, social classes are caused not by the seizure of power or wealth by one group, so much as the failure of a group or groups to adapt their lives to a change somewhere in the technological, economic, or political order. The resulting inequalities can then be blamed on another group in “*ressentiment*”—the longstanding re-feeling of a values clash in which one or one’s group felt unequal to another and unable to attain equality.³²⁶

As the subject has blind spots and the egoist seeks conclusions compatible with his or her egoism, so also is the group prone to developing blind spots and resisting questions and insights that threaten its social advantages or the usefulness of its social roles.³²⁷ As those who suffer from individual bias seek to soothe their uneasy consciences by the lies of rationalization, so do group egoists reinforce their irrational

³²⁴ *Insight*, 249.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*, 54.

³²⁶ *Ibid.*, 33. Lonergan relies on Max Scheler’s reworking of Nietzsche’s term, citing Manfred Frings, *Max Scheler* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, and Luvain: Nauwelaerts, 1965), h. 5. Lonergan read this book after writing *Insight*, and did not directly apply *ressentiment* to the development of group bias as the result of one group’s slow adaptation to change, but I believe it accounts concisely for the meaning of the process he describes at greater length in *Insight*.

³²⁷ *Insight*, 248.

and uncaring acts by the shared, systematic rationalization of ideology.³²⁸

Despite their similarities, group egoism is likely to be more damaging than individual bias. The individual egoist is resisted by the mass of society, but those who succumb to group bias have the reinforcement from others and from shared theories and doctrines. The broad effects of group bias and the difficulty of its reversal make group bias the cause of a “shorter cycle of decline,” to be discussed after general bias.

2.2.4. General Bias: Shortsightedness

Common sense, as discussed early in the first chapter, is a differentiation of human consciousness by which individuals in a society learn the community’s shared sets of meanings and values. It is a common fund of accumulated wisdom. On it people of all walks of life base their decisions and actions in all kinds of situations. Common sense is a wonderful human development, but it is not its only development. General bias “takes the narrow and complacent practicality of common sense and elevates it to the role of a complete and exclusive viewpoint.”³²⁹

Common sense is a specialized form of knowing. Its area of expertise is in the immediate, the concrete, and the particular—in the multitude of minor, everyday life problems. There is much that lies outside its reach, however. It is prone to forgetting its limitations as well as to rationalizing its limitations by saying that other forms of knowledge are useless or even untrue. “Every specialist runs the risk of turning his specialty into a bias by failing to recognize and appreciate the significance of other

³²⁸ *Method*, 55, 357-58.

³²⁹ *Insight*, 256.

fields.”³³⁰

Though not alone in this possibility, common sense has a strong tendency towards it. In its great competence yet narrow focus on the indispensable tasks of living, it can easily mistake itself to be omni-competent. It is indifferent to reaching abstract and universal laws, to attending to larger issues of the greater whole, and, most importantly, to considering long-term consequences of human action. Common sense’s main task is to make swiftly a multitude of pressing decisions. It may consider an action’s effects on more than one person and even on more than a particular group. But in its focus on the immediate situation, common sense does not consider adequately the effects of a decision on the surrounding environmental conditions, on the next generation, or the ones following.

This is a significant problem because humans can direct emergent probability to some degree. We can grasp the conditions for and the probabilities of the emergence of various schemes of recurrence, and with this knowledge we can act to transform conditions and shift probabilities—increasing the likelihood that some schemes will arise and decreasing the likelihood that others will emerge. In other words, human beings become in some measure the executors of human and global development. To do this, we need to recognize how our present insights, decisions, and actions will influence our potential future insights, decisions, and actions. Looking even further into the future, we can recognize how the efforts of one generation can affect the possibilities open to successive generations. Common sense takes into account the next step or two, but what

³³⁰ Ibid., 251.

of the next ten? It is common sense to educate our young, but can common sense teach them to consider the welfare of all humanity throughout history?³³¹

Lonergan believes that common sense is

unequal to the task of thinking on the level of history. It stands above the scotosis of the dramatic subject, above the egoism of the individual, above the bias of dominant and of depressed but militant groups that realize only the ideas they see to be to their immediate advantage. But the general bias of common sense prevents it from being effective in realizing ideas, however appropriate and reasonable, that suppose a long view or that set up higher integrations or that involve the solution of intricate and disputed issues.³³²

These are matters for science and theory, both natural and social, from physics to human history. “The challenge of history is for man progressively to enlarge the realm of conscious grasp and deliberate choice.”³³³

Compounding the limits of common sense is its rationalization of its limited competence. General bias adds “sins of refusal” to common sense’s “sins of omission.” In its one-sided emphasis on immediate practicality, it makes “insistent desires and contracting fears” of the immediate situation the only standard for ideas.³³⁴ It ridicules the far-ranging views of history and science as irrelevant and impractical. This leads to a whole succession of problems we will discuss in the next section on decline.

2.3. Decline

Lonergan asserts that it is easy to fall into the aberrations of bias but difficult to correct them:

Egoists do not turn into altruists overnight. Hostile groups do not easily forget their grievances, drop their resentments, overcome their fears and suspicions. Common sense commonly feels itself omniscient in practical affairs, commonly is blinded to long-

³³¹ Ibid., 252.

³³² Ibid., 253.

³³³ Ibid.

³³⁴ Ibid.

term consequences of policies and courses of action, commonly is unaware of the admixture of common nonsense in its more cherished convictions and slogans.³³⁵

The extent of aberration is variable. “The greater it is, the more rapidly it will distort the process of cumulative change and bring birth a host of social and cultural problems.”³³⁶ Such is decline.

2.3.1. *Shorter Cycle*

Decline is a negative cumulative process. Bias causes oversight; oversight causes “unintelligent policies and inept courses of action;” unintelligent policies and inept action lead to absurd situations.³³⁷ As this scheme of bias, oversight, policy, action, and changed situations recurs, biases deepen, oversights abound, and policies become more unintelligent. Actions become more inept and situations more absurd.

Loneragan distinguishes between shorter and longer cycles of decline. The shorter cycle is caused by group bias. We have discussed the origins of aberrant social inequalities. However, we have not discussed the cumulative effects and the accelerated formation of harmful and absurd elements in the social situation. Lonergan’s exposition of the shorter cycle of decline picks up where his analysis of group bias and aberrant social classes left off: When one group’s success comes at the expense of other groups’, the successful group must seek increasing amounts of power in order to stay in power. Ideas that benefit society as a whole are increasingly left behind as the powerful group only backs ideas that increase its hold on society. Lonergan discusses the cumulative effects of group bias: “those in favor find success the key to still further success; those

³³⁵ *Method*, 53.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, 53-54.

³³⁷ *Insight*, 8. Emphasis added.

unable to make operative the ideas that are to their advantage fall behind in the process of social development.” The “haves” become more and more separated from the “have-nots.” The “haves” divert an increasing amount of social resources from institutions that benefit all to “devising and implementing offensive and defensive mechanisms.”³³⁸

But there is hope. This shorter cycle of decline caused by group bias creates the principles for its own reversal. In its growing power and abuse of power, the successful group calls into being “an opposed group egoism.”³³⁹ Incomplete ideas forced on society by one group at first may go unrecognized as such, except by a few experts, but eventually their negative consequences damage peoples’ lives and their incompleteness is brought to light for all. Groups made unsuccessful become motivated toward reform or revolution. Dominant groups can be reactionary, progressive, or a mixture of both. To the degree that they are reactionary, their suppression of other ideas calls forth revolutionaries and the situation heads towards violence. Progressives, who aim at correcting their own oversights, are met by liberals, and the two groups may agree on an end while debating “the pace of change and the mode and measure of its execution.”³⁴⁰

2.3.2. *Longer Cycle*

When general bias is added to group bias, the result is a further distorted dialectic of community. Group bias alone can initiate a cycle of decline, but this cycle tends not to be short, because the practical plans discarded by the dominant group are “championed later by depressed groups.”³⁴¹ But if the society’s problems are compounded by general

³³⁸ Ibid., 249.

³³⁹ Ibid.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., 250.

³⁴¹ Ibid., 252.

bias's neglect of long-term solutions good for the whole of society, then all groups neglect the kind of ideas that would reverse decline. There begins the longer cycle of decline.

In normal positive development, questions lead to insights, problems lead to solutions, higher viewpoints are attained, and better situations are achieved. But caught in the longer cycle of decline, society consistently disregards "timely and fruitful ideas." This precludes their implementation, and furthermore, it prevents the conditions for the possibility of other truly practical ideas to arise in the future. Consequently, the social situation deteriorates at an accelerating rate. Bad ideas lead to bad situations, which result in worse ideas and to worsened situations. Social schemes and functions become corrupted, some die, and some grow out of control. The effects can be seen on technological, economic, and political levels. Sluggishness leads to stagnation. The best that one can hope for is a balance of powers.

What is worse, the deteriorating situation seems to provide the uncritical, biased mind with factual evidence in which the bias is claimed to be verified. So in ever increasing measure intelligence comes to be regarded as irrelevant to practical living. Human activity settles down to a decadent routine and initiative becomes the privilege of *violence*.³⁴²

In addition to deteriorating social relations, general bias has negative effects on cultural systems of evaluating and criticizing the society's values. Its disregard for intellectual pursuits and all that is not deemed "immediately practical" banishes art and literature into an ivory tower, makes philosophy a mere curiosity, and constricts religion to the private sphere:

³⁴² Ibid., 8

Cognitive self-transcendence is neither an easy notion to grasp nor a readily accessible datum of consciousness to be verified. Values have a certain esoteric imperiousness, but can they keep outweighing carnal pleasure, wealth, power? Religion undoubtedly had its day, but is not that day over? Is it not illusory comfort for weaker souls, an opium distributed by the rich to quiet the poor, a mythical projection of a man's own excellence into the sky?³⁴³

It is normal for common sense to be in tension with higher intellectual pursuits. Typically persons of common sense can find “a profoundly satisfying escape from the grim realities of daily living by turning to men of culture, to representatives of religion, to spokesmen of philosophy.”³⁴⁴ But general bias wipes out any validity to these other forms of knowing. Without them, people lose humanizing sources of play and exaltation. Culture, religion and philosophy may remain in name, but their goals and methods become those of common sense. There can still be discovery and development, but the culture will be uncritical. There will be limited concern for possibilities, no standard of truth, and no normative measurement of value. Life becomes absurd.

It is bad enough for general bias to banish culture to an ivory tower; worse yet is the co-opting of science, culture, religion, and philosophy into justifying the absurdities of decline. Through the perversion of these “higher” pursuits, spontaneous rationalizations are sustained, hardened, and handed on in ideology. “Imperceptibly the corruption spreads from the harsh sphere of material advantage and power to the mass media, the stylish journals, the literary movements, the educational process, the reigning philosophies. A civilization in decline digs its own grave with a relentless consistency.”³⁴⁵

³⁴³ *Method*, 243.

³⁴⁴ *Insight*, 255; cf., *Method*, 242-44.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 55.

On all levels of the human good, from material conditions to higher culture and personal value, there is created the “social surd”—elements of a social situation that exist but are unintelligible.³⁴⁶ In the longer cycle of decline, the surd expands exponentially, “and so there is an increasing demand for further contractions of the claims of intelligence, for further dropping of old principles and norms, for closer conformity to an ever growing manmade incoherence immanent in manmade facts.”³⁴⁷

At the root of decline and the resultant social surd is a frustration of the core of human nature, the “eros of the human spirit,” our self-transcendent desire for truth, goodness, and love. “As self-transcendence promotes progress, so the refusal of self-transcendence turns progress into cumulative decline.”³⁴⁸ The frustration of this eros to self-transcendence is a crucial, basic sin, because “the social surd resides least of all in outer things and most of all in the minds and wills of men.”³⁴⁹

Sin and bias, as well as rationalizations and ideologies, alienate people from reality, from each other, and even from themselves. The basic form of alienation is the disregard of the transcendental precepts: Be attentive, Be intelligent, Be reasonable, Be responsible. As these precepts are disregarded, there increasingly is formed a “familiar opposition between the idealism of human aspiration and the sorry facts of human performance.”³⁵⁰

In the longer cycle of decline, this opposition is reduced, not by an improvement in human performance, but by the lowering of human ideals. Ideology perpetuates

³⁴⁶ *Insight*, 254-57 651-52, 712-16.

³⁴⁷ *Method*, 256.

³⁴⁸ *Method*, 55.

³⁴⁹ *Insight*, 712.

³⁵⁰ “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 25, cf. 26. See also, *Method*, 55, 357-58.

alienation of persons from their self-transcendent cores.³⁵¹ It transforms the entire culture, which should function as “social conscience,”³⁵² into a social justification for the social surd. For a community in the longer cycle of decline, confronted by increasingly absurd situations, culture becomes pervaded by an “ultimate nihilism.”³⁵³ So with “a succession of so-called bold spirits” we have “a series of rationalizations” and “ideology” until “sin ascends its regal throne (Romans 5:21) in the Augustinian *civitas terrena*.”³⁵⁴

Eventually, the fruit of general bias and the longer cycle of decline is totalitarianism and war. Lonergan discusses the ultimate consequences of mistaking common sense’s narrow practical standards for the ultimate standards of truth and value:

[E]very type of intellectual independence, whether personal, cultural, scientific, philosophic or religious has no better basis than nonconscious myth.... Reality is the economic development, the military equipment, and the political dominance of the all-inclusive state. Its ends justify all means. Its means include not merely every technique of indoctrination and propaganda, every tactic of economic and diplomatic pressure, every device for breaking down the moral conscience and exploiting the secret affects of civilized man, but also the terrorism of a political police, of prisons and torture, of concentration camps, of transported or extirpated minorities, and of total war.³⁵⁵

As wars increase in violence, the longer cycle heads to an end of total destruction. However, as emergent probability teaches, nothing is necessarily inevitable. The longer cycle need not end in total destruction. This cycle is long because it teaches a lesson of utmost difficulty, namely that the needs of human living are not adequately met by common sense, not even by a combination of technology, economics, and politics. What humanity needs is “a higher viewpoint.”³⁵⁶ Part of this higher viewpoint is the

³⁵¹ *Insight*, 712. Cf. *Method*, 55, 364.

³⁵² “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 26.

³⁵³ *Insight*, 259.

³⁵⁴ “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 26.

³⁵⁵ *Insight*, 256-57.

³⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 259.

perspective possible in the higher realms of meaning such as in theory (including the theories of science and history), and interiority (which teaches self-appropriation and thus the discovery of the natural, self-transcendent thrust to truth, value, and love).

However, a full and lasting solution, one that would shift probabilities to favor decline over progress, one that could solve the longer cycle of blocked insight, worsening situations, banished culture, hardened ideologies, totalitarianism, and total war, would require an absolutely transcendent viewpoint, a supernatural vector in human history. Such a solution, for Lonergan, becomes possible only through divine redemption.

Chapter 3. Redemption: Nature Raised into Supernature

For Lonergan, everyday life is problematic. Whether simple or difficult, life's many challenges ultimately lead to ultimate questions. These ultimate questions are questions about God, the universe, and God's relation to the universe:

The facts of good and evil, of progress and decline, raise questions about the character of our universe. Such questions have been put in very many ways, and the answers given have been even more numerous. But behind this multiplicity there is a basic unity that comes to light in the exercise of transcendental method. We can inquire into the possibility of fruitful inquiry. We can deliberate whether our deliberating is worth while. In each case, there arises the question of God.³⁵⁷

We praise progress and denounce every manifestation of decline. But is the universe on our side or we just gamblers and, if we are gamblers, are we not perhaps fools, individually struggling for authenticity and collectively endeavoring to snatch progress from the ever mounting welter of decline?... Such is the question about God.³⁵⁸

Indeed, since God is the first agent of every event and emergence and development, the question really is what God is or has been doing about the fact of evil.³⁵⁹

Redemption is Lonergan's answer to the question of what God is doing and has been doing in a world confronted by "the facts of good and evil, of progress and decline."³⁶⁰ Our examination of redemption, will first clarify what is meant by the "absolutely supernatural" aspect of grace. Then will follow the distinction of two general aspects of grace: its "healing" of nature from a fallen state and its "elevation" of nature into the absolutely supernatural order. From this distinction we proceed to the

³⁵⁷ *Method*, 101.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 102-3.

³⁵⁹ *Insight*, 709.

³⁶⁰ Interestingly, Lonergan called redemption *renaissance* in some of his earliest formulations of the dialectic of history. This is seen in the unpublished essays, "Outline for an Analytic Conception of History" and "Analytic Conception of History." See, Shute, 148-54, 182. Shute does not say why or when Lonergan changed from "renaissance" to "redemption."

concrete effects of grace in religious, moral, and intellectual conversion. The chapter ends with a discussion of two communities formed by and formative of persons affected by grace and conversion: a natural “cosmopolis” and a graced Body of Christ. Our movement is governed by two principles: (1) from older theories to newer, from static to dynamic, from classical to historical; and (2) from surrounding conditions to personal factors to social orders to historical implications. These principles have guided the organization of each of our two previous chapters on progress and decline.

3.1. Grace

3.1.1. The Supernatural, Relatively and Absolutely

The theology of grace is both simple and complex. Not just any gift from God is a gift of grace. All that humanity has and is, it has been given by God. Grace, however, is an extraordinary gift. It is God’s gift to creation that goes beyond the natural goodness of creation. Defined simply, grace is God’s gift of Godself to the world. What does it mean for God to give God’s self to the world? This is complex and ultimately mysterious. God and God’s gift of Godself in grace are absolutely supernatural. What does “absolutely supernatural” mean? We may remember that for Lonergan, oxygen’s operation on chemical levels is natural.³⁶¹ Its operation on higher levels, such as human respiratory schemes, is supernatural, but “relatively supernatural,” since chemical and biological schemes are both part of the natural order. In contrast, the absolutely

³⁶¹ Section 1.2.4., above.

supernatural transcends all of created nature, including our ability to understand it comprehensively.³⁶²

Despite transcending created nature, divine grace remains harmonious with nature. In concrete reality, the absolutely supernatural is not a separate addition to nature. It is neither independent of, destructive of, nor counter-operational to nature. Rather, as natural biological rhythms presuppose, sublate, and go beyond natural chemical levels, so supernatural grace presupposes, sublates, and goes beyond all of created nature. As the biological schemes are higher orders of what is systematic and nonsystematic on a chemical level, the supernatural order of redemption is a higher order of what is systematic and nonsystematic in human progress and decline. In short, God's supernatural gift of grace is consistent with a world order of emergent probability.

Lonergan speaks eloquently about the harmony of supernatural grace with the natural order:

[A] concrete plurality of essences has an upthrust from lower to higher levels.... [This is] conspicuous to one who looks at the universe with the eyes of modern science, who sees sub-atoms uniting into atoms, atoms into compounds, compounds into organisms, who finds the pattern of genes in reproductive cells shifting, *ut in minori parte*, to give organic evolution within limited ranges, who attributes the rise of cultures and civilizations to the interplay of human plurality, who observes that only when and where the higher rational culture emerged did God acknowledge the fullness of time permitting the Word to become flesh and the mystical body to begin its intussusception of human personalities and its leavening of human history.³⁶³

The general harmony of supernature with nature notwithstanding, there is one crucial difference. The supernatural grace that flows from the divine missions of the Son

³⁶² We shall consider the mysterious nature of the supernatural and our limited ability to understand it in part 2, chapter 1 of this dissertation.

³⁶³ "Finality, Love, Marriage," 21. In a footnote Lonergan notes an "affinity" between modern "statistical law" and Aristotelian *contingens ut in maiori parte* and between modern "chance variation" and the *contingens ut in minori parte*.

and the Spirit is utterly, absolutely beyond what nature could achieve on its own. Grace is not a scheme of recurrence that more or less probably emerges from natural processes. There is nothing a human person or human societies can do to merit the supernatural gift that is grace.

This is just a general word on grace. A full picture of a traditional Christian theology of grace would include many types used to distinguish various aspects and effects of grace. For example, grace can be divided into actual and habitual, operative and cooperative, healing and elevating.³⁶⁴

3.1.2. *Healing and Elevating Grace*

The distinction we are interested in here is between healing and elevating grace.³⁶⁵ The first type, in Latin, is *gratia sanans*, translated as the grace that saves, cleanses, cures, or heals. It heals humanity of the effects of sin and restores nature to its natural state. In older terms, *gratia sanans* frees us of the vicious habits that dispose us to sin. It “plucks out the heart of stone that made the sinner a slave to sin; it implants a heart of flesh to initiate a new continuity in justice.”³⁶⁶ It is “the liberation of human liberty.”³⁶⁷ In terms of Lonergan’s dialectic of history, healing grace counteracts the forces of decline and enables their reversal. Overcoming bias, it allows human persons to become more attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible.

³⁶⁴ For a very detailed account of grace, see Lonergan’s *Grace and Freedom*.

³⁶⁵ This distinction of Philip the Chancellor in the early 1200’s was part of a “‘Copernican revolution’ in theory” that distinguished between the two orders of nature and supernature, between “the familiar series of grace, faith, charity, and merit” and “nature, reason, and the natural love of God.” *Grace and Freedom*, 17.

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 58.

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 50.

The second type of grace is an elevating or sanctifying grace called *gratia elevans*. Elevating grace causes things to emerge that are not possible to the natural world of emergent probability. It enables human beings to operate on levels beyond their “own steam.” Traditionally conceived, *gratia elevans* “infuses” us with (or gives us) the supernatural virtues of faith, hope, and charity,³⁶⁸ and it allows us to know God face to face, to know as we are known.³⁶⁹ For Lonergan, its primary effects are on cognitive, moral, and affective levels of humanity. But its implications quickly move into the social realms of personal relations as well as the cultural realms of shared meaning and value. Eventually its effects extend to all of creation.

3.2. Religious, Moral, and Intellectual Conversion³⁷⁰

As we have mentioned in the section on the human good, Lonergan defines conversion in terms of horizontal and vertical liberty. Horizontal liberty is the exercise of choice within a horizon. Vertical liberty is a radical choice, a leap of self-transcendence, that expands, changes, or transforms one’s horizon. Sometimes, the new horizon, “though notably deeper and broader and richer” than the previous horizon, may still be “consonant with the old and a development out of its potentialities.” However, sometimes a new horizon is “an about-face; it comes out of the old by repudiating

³⁶⁸ Cf., *Topics in Education*, 242-43. We will discuss faith, hope, and love further in the section on “religious conversion.”

³⁶⁹ “Openness and Religious Experience,” 200-1

³⁷⁰ Lonergan acknowledges a possible fourth conversion developed by one of his best students, Robert Doran, S.J. In “Reality, Myth, Symbol,” Lonergan calls it an “advance” and describes it: “It occurs when we uncover within ourselves the working of our own psyches, the *élan vital*...” He refers the reader to Fr. Doran’s writing in such places as “Psychic Conversion,” *The Thomist* 41 (April 1977) 200-36; *Subject and Psyche: Ricoeur, Jung, and the Search for Foundations* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1977). Fr. Doran tells me its effect is to offset dramatic bias since it is psychogenetic. Recently he has found it to be helpful in his study of the French interdisciplinary thinker René Girard, because much of what Girard discusses is in this realm.

characteristic features; it begins a new sequence that can keep revealing ever greater depth and breadth and wealth. Such an about-face and new beginning is what is meant by a conversion.”³⁷¹

Conversion is a positive change in the orientation of one’s liberty towards possible choices or terminal values. It causes a radical shift in one’s fears and desires, satisfactions and values, beliefs and scales of preference. It frees one from inauthenticity for greater authenticity.

If conversion seems to function in a manner similar to grace, this is no accident. Conversion, particularly religious conversion, is the framework for Lonergan’s discussion of what traditional theology calls “sanctifying grace,” that is, “an entitative habit, absolutely supernatural, infused into the essence of the soul.”³⁷² Conversion is part of Lonergan’s larger “transition from theoretical to methodical theology” which begins “not from a metaphysical psychology, but from intentionality analysis, and, indeed from transcendental method.”³⁷³ The contents of this analysis and the components of this method are organized as a threefold self-transcendence: (1) as *intellectual* in attaining knowledge, (2) as *moral* in seeking what is truly good and in becoming a principle of benevolence and beneficence, and (3) as *religious* in falling in love with God and all things. Religious conversion is a type of *affective* conversion.³⁷⁴ Whereas affective

³⁷¹ *Method*, 237-38.

³⁷² *Ibid.*, 120.

³⁷³ *Ibid.*, 289.

³⁷⁴ Lonergan mentions affective conversion in the trio intellectual, moral, and affective conversion, in “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” 179. Affective conversion is unpacked as “love in the family, loyalty in the community, and faith in God,” and similarly as “commitment to love in the home, loyalty in the community, faith in the destiny of man.” Both quotes seem to discuss an unrestricted love, one of which focuses on God, and the other on humanity. Similarly, in chapter four of *Method*, “Religion,”

conversion could begin at any point, with falling in love with one's family, one's community, *or* with God, religious conversion is specified as falling in love with God *and thereby* with all things. Religious conversion is the culmination of affective conversion. It is "the deep-set joy and solid peace, the power and the vigor, of being in love with God."³⁷⁵

3.2.1. *Religious Conversion*

If one's being-in-love is a result of being in love with God, then, according to "theoretical theology," one is in a state of "sanctifying grace." Being-in-love with God, as a technical term of Lonergan's intentionality analysis, is not an abstract metaphysical concept. It is a dynamic state that results from a type of concrete experience Lonergan calls religious conversion.

What does Lonergan mean by "religious"? Interestingly, he does not mean what commonly is meant by religion, at least in the contemporary United States. He does not mean an organized body of people who share beliefs and practices relating them to a transcendent being or force. Nor does he exclude members of such bodies, or their systems of belief and practice, from the religious. The religious, for Lonergan, is more than any one such organization or even all such organizations.³⁷⁶ It pertains to "a reality that transcends the reality of this world,"³⁷⁷ a Being that is not virtually unconditioned but absolutely unconditioned, a Value by which all values are measured, a Love that

Lonergan discusses two exceptions to the "normal" way by which knowing precedes loving. The first flows from God's love being poured into our hearts and the second arises when human persons fall in love with each other (*Method*, 122. See section 1.5.2, above.).

³⁷⁵ *Method*, 39. We will focus on being in love with God toward the end of this chapter.

³⁷⁶ Lonergan's view on the relation of Christianity to other religions is interesting and fertile but beyond the scope of this dissertation.

³⁷⁷ *Method*, 102.

knows no bounds. In our unrestricted desires to know and to choose, an unrestricted transcendent object is intended. That Being, Value, Love, and transcendent object is God.

Religious experience, the experience of God, is not the product of our knowing and choosing, nor is it properly an experience, for God is not a being among other beings. Religious “experience” is more of a religious consciousness that “occupies the fourth and highest level of man’s intentional consciousness. It takes over the peak of the soul, the *apex animae*.”³⁷⁸ But while religious experience begins at the peak of the soul, religious conversion produces a being-in-love that affects the whole person on all levels of consciousness. Religious conversion is the fulfillment of the natural human thrust toward self-transcendence:

Being in love with God, as experienced, is being in love in an unrestricted fashion. All love is self-surrender, but being in love with God is being in love without limits or qualifications or conditions or reservations. Just as unrestricted questioning is our capacity for self-transcendence, so being in love in an unrestricted fashion is the proper fulfillment of that capacity.³⁷⁹

Rudolf Otto describes being in love with God as an encounter with *mysterium facinans et tremendum* [the mystery that both fascinates and terrifies]. Paul Tillich identifies it as “being grasped by ultimate concern.” And for St. Ignatius Loyola it is called “consolation with no cause.”³⁸⁰

³⁷⁸ Ibid., 107.

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 106. Cf., 242: “Questions for intelligence, for reflection, for deliberation reveal the eros of the human spirit, its capacity and its desire for self-transcendence. But that capacity meets fulfillment, that desire turns to joy, when religious conversion transforms the existential subject into a subject in love, a subject held, grasped, possessed, owned through a total and so an other-worldly love.”

³⁸⁰ *Method*, 106, referencing Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy* (London: Oxford, 1923) [and here noting that *tremendum* varies in meaning depending on one’s religious development]; D.M. Bron, *ultimate Concern: Tillich in Dialogue* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965); and Karl Rahner, *The Dynamic Element in the Church, Quaestiones disputate 12* (Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1964), 131.

Lonergan holds that such religious experience is common to different religious traditions, even though it is interpreted and expressed differently by each.³⁸¹ For Christians it is sanctifying grace, “God’s love flooding our hearts through the Holy Spirit given to us.”³⁸² It lifts us up into the loving, trinitarian unity, and transforms us into “temples of Christ’s Spirit, members of his body, adopted children of the Father.”³⁸³

The state of being in love is manifested in numerous ways, for it transforms one’s whole way of being in the world. Many of these manifestations, expressions, or fruits have been discussed above under the general heading of love, and most of the particular ones will be considered under the following headings of charity, faith, and hope.

Here I would like to focus on the religious *word*, by which Lonergan means “any expression of religious meaning or of religious value. Its carrier may be intersubjectivity, or art, or symbol, or language, or the remembered and portrayed lives or deeds or achievements of individuals or classes or groups.”³⁸⁴ Religious conversion is mediated to human beings by both religious experience and the religious word. By the religious word, divine grace enters into the world mediated by meaning and regulated by value. For human communities, there is a mutually beneficial relationship between the religious word and the common language and culture. On the one hand, the religious word endows a culture with its deepest meaning and its highest values. On the other hand, it is only in the context of a culture’s meanings and values that human persons can come to

³⁸¹ Cf., *Method*, 108-09.

³⁸² Ibid., 241. This paraphrases Rom. 5:5, Lonergan’s most frequently cited passage of scripture. Andrew Tallon, “The Role of the Connaturalized Heart in Veritatis Splendor,” *Veritatis Splendor: American Responses*, ed. Michael Allsopp and John O’Keefe (Kansas City, MO: Sheed & Ward, 1995), 151.

³⁸³ “*Existenz and Aggiornamento*,” 249.

³⁸⁴ *Method*, 112.

understand the religious word and to relate it both to the object of ultimate concern and to more proximate objects of ordinary concerns.

What exactly is the religious word? Lonergan distinguishes between “the prior word that God speaks to us by flooding our hearts with his love”³⁸⁵ and the outer word that is expressed in time and space. The outer word is not separate from love or an incidental byproduct of love (merely an expression of love). Rather, the outer word is constitutive of love. “When a man and a woman love each other but do not avow their love, they are not yet in love. Their very silence means that their love has not reached the point of self-surrender and self-donation.”³⁸⁶ The expression of love is constitutive of love because the outer word realizes love, sustains it, and helps it to grow. For religion, this is the role of “the word of *tradition* that has accumulated religious wisdom, the word of *fellowship* that unites those that share in the gift of God’s love, the word of the *gospel* that announces that God has loved us first and, in the fullness of time, has revealed that love in Christ crucified, dead and risen.”³⁸⁷

As expressed in time, space, and culture the outer word is historically conditioned. Its meaning is understood by changing subjects in a context of other, non-religious words whose meaning changes. As the meanings of a culture’s words change, a religious tradition’s words adapt if the meanings of its doctrines are to remain understood as they are intended. Furthermore, religious expression takes part in the development of the various realms of meaning: common sense, theory, interiority, and transcendence.

³⁸⁵ Ibid.

³⁸⁶ Ibid., 113.

³⁸⁷ Ibid. Emphasis added. Cf., 283: “[T]he gift of God’s love has its proper counterpart in the revelational events in which God discloses to a particular people or to all mankind the completeness of his love for them.”

Tensions may arise when words conceived in a common-sense context are transposed into a theoretical context, and vice versa, since the meaning of the same word is different in both contexts. Even if the tension is resolvable by a movement into the higher realms of interiority and transcendence, religious words must continually undergo a type of translation for proper communication.³⁸⁸

In all cultures and in all of these realms of meaning, a primary function of the religious word is to work with love to help people grow in religious conversion. Concretely, religious conversion is not simply a moment; it is a lifelong, precarious process. In itself, religious conversion is an end, the fulfillment of self-transcendence, but the subject in this life, even those religiously converted are always “on the way.” Though one may be a being-in-love, there are always further depths to love, and there remains the need to make one’s knowing and doing conform to one’s loving.

For that love is the utmost of self-transcendence, and man’s self-transcendence is ever precarious. Of itself, self-transcendence involves tension between the self as transcending and the self as transcended. So human authenticity is never some pure and serene and secure possession. It is ever a withdrawal from unauthenticity and every successful withdrawal only brings to light the need for still further withdrawals.... Genuine religion is discovered and realized by redemption from the many traps of religious aberration. So we are bid to watch and pray, to make our way in fear and trembling. And it is the greatest saints that proclaim themselves the greatest sinners, though their sins seem slight indeed to holy folk that lack their discernment and love.³⁸⁹

Despite this lack of perfection in this life, there can be great progress. Citing scripture, Lonergan reminds us of how one may know if one or if others are authentically

³⁸⁸ Ibid., 113-14. See also, ch. 14, “Communication.”

³⁸⁹ Ibid., 110; cf., 252.

living out religious conversion: “[Y]ou will recognize them by their fruits’ (Mt.7, 20).”³⁹⁰

Prominent among the fruits of religious conversion are (1) the charity that allows us to love our neighbors as ourselves, (2) the faith that enables us to “see with the eyes of love,” and (3) the hope by which we measure our successes and problems by an expected ultimate fulfillment. Faith, hope, and charity are mentioned by Paul in 1 Cor. 13:13 as abiding Christian virtues in this life. Thomas Aquinas used Aristotle’s philosophical account of virtue to interpret faith, hope, and charity. In his *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle explains that virtues are habits—dispositions of the soul, that are good (as opposed to bad habits, or vices). Aristotle’s virtues are *acquired* by practice, or repeated action. However, Thomas teaches that the Christian virtues of faith, hope, and charity are *infused* or given by God, and thus, they are called the “theological” virtues. As Thomas’s interpretation of charity, faith, and hope sublates Aristotle’s virtue theory, so Lonergan’s methodological interpretation of these virtues sublates Thomas’s metaphysical account. All three virtues, like the three conversions, are not the products of human achievement but the free gifts of God’s unmerited grace.³⁹¹

3.2.1.1. *Charity*

Charity is a religious love central to the reversal of decline and the restoration of progress. It is an infused, supernatural love with both healing and elevating effects. It is

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 119; cf., 269. Here, Lonergan extends this to moral and intellectual conversion.

³⁹¹ Thus, Lonergan scholar, John Haughey calls them a “receivment.” See John Haughey, “The Primacy of Receivment,” *Business as Calling*, an E-Book at <http://www.stthomas.edu/cathstudies/cst/mgmt/publications/businessasacalling.html>.

“the charity of the suffering servant,” the “self-sacrificing love” of Christ.³⁹² Charity is not a bias, but rather it heals a person of his/her biases, thus liberating her/his transcendental desire and transcendental operations. Because charity “promotes self-transcendence to the point, not merely of justice, but of self-sacrificial love,” it has “a redemptive role in society, inasmuch as such love can undo the mischief of decline and restore the cumulative process of progress.”³⁹³ “For only inasmuch as men are willing to meet evil with good, to love their enemies, to pray for those that persecute and calumniate them, that the social surd is a potential good.”³⁹⁴

Charity operates on the whole person and the entire society, but its primary activity is on the fourth level of human conscious intentionality, the level of decision and commitment. Charity creates a good will. It enables a person to make authentic, responsible decisions. Lonergan examines three decisions in particular: (1) to love God, the world order, and all people, (2) to repent one’s sin, and (3) to be joyful.

Charity is the cure for bias. As bias shrinks the horizon of one’s concern, charity expands it. To the extent that we love God, we love as God loves; our love is unrestricted; it flows to all things God loves, which includes all people, all things, indeed the whole order of the universe:

[T]he actual order of the universe is a good and value chosen by God... Moreover, it grounds the emergence, and includes the excellence of every other good within the universe, so that to will any other good is to will the order of the universe... [A]nd so, to

³⁹² *Method*, 117; cf. 55, 113, 242, 291, 342, 362. Self-sacrifice is a difficult concept. It will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter.

³⁹³ *Ibid.*, 55.

³⁹⁴ *Insight*, 721. This is a key part of the second chapter and will be considered in greater detail there, including its problematic aspects.

will the order of the universe because of one's love of God is to love all persons in the universe because of one's love of God.³⁹⁵

This love leads to repentance for sin. An expansion of concern brings to mind all one's past mistakes, all one's failures to love. In the light of religious love, one grows to repent of one's surrender to evil and bias, and of one's contributions to decline. The charitable soul:

deplores and regrets the scotosis of its dramatic bias and its involvement in the individual, group, and general bias of common sense; it repents its flight from self-knowledge, its rationalization of wrong, its surrender to evil; it detests its commitment to counterpositions [inauthentic beliefs], its contribution to man's decline through the successive adjustments of theory to ever worse practice, its share in the genesis and the propagation of the myths that confer on appearance the strength and power and passion that are the due of reality.³⁹⁶

Repentance is not merely a feeling of guilt. It is a more conscious, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible act that acknowledges our sin. We repent not only our actions against our own self-transcendence, and not only our acts against other human persons, but also our sins against God, for sin conceals the goodness of God and the universe from oneself and from others.

Repentance involves sorrow, but sorrow is not the last word. One looks back to past failure, but also forward to a bright future. The person "is at one with the universe in being in love with God, and it shares its dynamic resilience and expectancy." He or she celebrates the creativity of a world governed by emergent probability. Charity, thus, causes a deep joy in all things of creation.³⁹⁷

³⁹⁵ Ibid., 722.

³⁹⁶ Ibid, cf. *Method*, 110, 117, 364.

³⁹⁷ *Insight*, 722.

In the love, repentance, and joy, of charity “one’s living is transformed into a personal relation to the one loved above all and in all.”³⁹⁸ Charity affects all of one’s life, and the effect is that all of one’s living becomes a living in dialogue with God.

3.2.1.2. *Faith*

In addition to charity, being in love with God produces faith. Faith is a form of the aforementioned knowledge born of love. However, it is an otherworldly, absolutely supernatural type of knowledge. Hence, Lonergan calls it “the knowledge born of *religious* love.”³⁹⁹ Faith, like the knowledge born of a natural love, is the heart’s reasons which reason does not know, so named by Pascal.⁴⁰⁰ As mentioned above, such knowledge, for Lonergan, reverses the normal, “from below upwards” vector of experience, understanding, judgment, and decision. A relationship of unrestricted love with God calls forth commitments and decisions on the fourth level of consciousness. These religious commitments and decisions bear fruit on the third level as judgments of truth and value. Such judgments constitute and are constituted by one’s faith. They form the cognitional background that conditions which ideas might occur to a person of faith on the second level of her/his consciousness. Finally, the judgments of value and truth received in faith shape the way a person experiences the world, on his/her first level of conscious intentionality.⁴⁰¹

Faith has a similar effect in the communal life of the church. Faith flows from the fundamental decisions and commitments of a community moved by charity. The

³⁹⁸ Ibid.

³⁹⁹ *Method*, 115, emphasis added.

⁴⁰⁰ See section 1.5.1., above.

⁴⁰¹ Such is “the way from above downwards.” See section 1.5.2., above.

community's faith becomes expressed in the judgments of its doctrine. Theologians then seek to better understand these doctrines through systematic theology and to connect them with the experience of the people through pastoral and practical theology.⁴⁰²

Faith is the "experienced fulfillment" of the natural human desire to know and to value. But it is an experience that is clouded. It is an overwhelming consciousness of "absolute intelligence and intelligibility, absolute truth and reality, absolute goodness and holiness."⁴⁰³ God becomes known most profoundly, yet God remains a mystery. The question of God recurs in a new form. Primarily it is an existential question of accepting or rejecting God, and only secondarily is it an intellectual question of knowing better either the Beloved whom one has accepted or the One whom one seeks to escape.

Faith is an "apprehension of transcendent value." It is an "actuated orientation towards the mystery of love and awe."⁴⁰⁴ This apprehension and orientation provide a re-orientation of one's entire world and thus a re-apprehension of all one's vital, social, cultural, and personal values.⁴⁰⁵

Without faith the originating value is man and the terminal value is the human good man brings about. But in the light of faith, originating value is divine light and love, while terminal value is the whole universe. So the human good becomes absorbed in an all-encompassing good. Where before an account of the human good related men to one another and to nature, now human concern reaches beyond man's world to God and to God's world.... Human development is not only in skills and virtues but also in holiness. The power of God's love brings forth a new energy and efficacy in all goodness, and the limit of human expectation ceases to be the grave.⁴⁰⁶

⁴⁰² *Method*, 336. See chs. 12, "Doctrines," 13, "Systematics," and 14, "Communications."

⁴⁰³ *Ibid.*, 116.

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 115.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 115.

⁴⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 116.

According to the model of faculty psychology, faith provides the “will’s hope with its object and assurance and the will’s charity with its motives.”⁴⁰⁷ According to Lonergan’s transcendental method, faith “places human efforts in a friendly universe; it reveals an ultimate significance in human achievement; it strengthens new undertakings with confidence.”⁴⁰⁸ Thus, faith has the unmistakable power of undoing decline, particularly the longer cycle of decline that is perpetuated by ideology:

Decline disrupts a culture with conflicting ideologies. It inflicts on individuals the social, economic, and psychological pressures that for human frailty amount to determinism. It multiplies and heaps up the abuses and absurdities that breed resentment, hatred, anger, violence. It is not propaganda and it is not argument but religious faith that will liberate human minds from its ideological prisons.⁴⁰⁹

To free human minds from the prisons of ideology, faith “reestablishes truth as a meaningful category.” Lonergan reminds us of the critical link between truth and resistance to sin by calling to mind Pilate’s (in)action that was enabled by his separation of himself from the truth, as revealed by his question, “What is truth?”⁴¹⁰

Furthermore, on cognitive levels, faith promotes a new order of meaning and values, one that flows from knowing that the universe is grounded in and moving toward unconditional love. “Without faith, without the eyes of love, the world is too evil for God to be good, for a good God to exist. But faith recognizes that God grants men their freedom, that he wills them to be persons and not just his automata, that he calls them to

⁴⁰⁷ *Insight*, 724.

⁴⁰⁸ *Method*, 117

⁴⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴¹⁰ *Topics in Education*, 67, with reference to Jn. 18:38.

the higher authenticity that overcomes evil with good.”⁴¹¹ From such faith there flows great hope.

3.2.1.3. *Hope*

Hope flows from the commitments of love and faith’s judgments of fact and value. Hope gives those caught in a spiral of decline the courage to resist personal and social tendencies to behave sinfully. It frees people from drudgery, “liberates the pilgrim in us,” and “enables us to resist the pressures and the determinisms that are, as it were, the necessity of sinning further.”⁴¹² Hope gives ordinary people the “heroism” needed to resist negative situations that increase the probabilities of sin. This is crucial in overcoming decline, for “without that heroism there is no victory over the cumulative effects of sin as a component in social process.”⁴¹³

According to faculty psychology, hope is a perfection of the will, a moral confidence that strengthens the intellect. This is important for Lonergan, because the intellect functions properly inasmuch as the detached and disinterested desire to know is dominant in cognitional operations. According to intentionality analysis, this desire is the spontaneous, prior foundation for intelligent, rational, and responsible self-consciousness. It is detached but not disembodied. Consequently it must compete, on the one hand, in a cooperative way with the natural attachments of sensitivity and spontaneous intersubjectivity and, on the other hand, in an oppositional way with the disordered

⁴¹¹ *Method*, 117.

⁴¹² *Topics in Education*, 67.

⁴¹³ *Ibid.* Cf. *Method*, 117.

attachments of bias. In this dialectic, hope reinforces the unrestricted desire with a responsible commitment to transcendent truth and goodness.⁴¹⁴

Furthermore, because of the unrestricted nature of human desire, there is the temptation either to despair at ever fulfilling this desire or to grasp at some easy yet inadequate fulfillment, i.e., an idol. Through hope, one knows that the objective of unrestricted desire exists and is promised, but that it lies beyond the reach of empirical science, common sense, their unification in metaphysics, and even the transcendent knowledge by which we know *that* God exists. Hope is confident that despite the transcendent nature of our fulfillment, it is promised. This confidence is a mean that excludes the extremes of “both despair and presumption.” Lonergan summarizes: “the conjugate form of willingness that aids and supports and reinforces the pure desire is a confident hope that God will bring man’s intellect to a knowledge, participation, possession of the unrestricted act of understanding.”⁴¹⁵

Some further aspects and effects of faith, hope, and charity are covered under moral and intellectual conversion, for the effects of religious conversion flow “from above downwards” from the peak of the human person to moral and cognitive aspects of human living. Intellectual conversion focuses on the truth grasped in cognitive self-transcendence, moral conversion pertains to values affirmed and realized in moral or “real” self-transcendence, and religious conversion brings one to a “total being-in-love as the efficacious ground of all self-transcendence, whether in the pursuit of truth, or in the

⁴¹⁴ *Insight*, 723.

⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 723-24.

realization of human values, or in the orientation man adopts to the universe, its ground, and its goal.”⁴¹⁶

3.2.2. *Moral Conversion*

Moral conversion is typically the fruit of religious conversion, but it can occur in a person independently of religious conversion. Like religious conversion, moral conversion operates mainly on the level of choice and decision, but its effects are less pervasive and less expansive than those of religious conversion. The results particular to moral conversion include decisions that are more consistently responsible and that produce better consequences for oneself and the community, in not only the short term but also the long run.

A key to the development of moral conversion is the discovery that one’s choice for a particular good selects and influences not merely a single object, but a whole range and system of objects that go into the production, distribution, maintenance, and disposal of the object (i.e., a good of order). Furthermore, one recognizes that along with choosing a particular object and a good of order, one is choosing oneself and who one is to become. This critical point occurs “when the subject finds out for himself that it is up to himself to decide what he is to make of himself.”⁴¹⁷

A further aspect of moral conversion is the shift in the criteria of one’s decisions from satisfactions to values, from the apparent good to what truly is good, from a calculus of “pleasures and pains” to what truly is the right thing to do. Ideally, this shift is a natural product of human development, of human maturing:

⁴¹⁶ *Method*, 241.

⁴¹⁷ “Existenz and Aggiornamento,” 242; cf. *Method*, 240.

As children or minors we are persuaded, cajoled, ordered, compelled to do what is right. As our knowledge of human reality increases, as our responses to human values are strengthened and refined, our mentors more and more leave us to ourselves so that our freedom may exercise its ever advancing thrust toward authenticity.⁴¹⁸

Lonergan's name for one who has not yet begun the process of moral conversion is the "drifter": "The drifter has not yet found himself; he has not yet discovered his own deed and so is content to do whatever everyone else is doing."⁴¹⁹ In other words the drifter will choose, think, say, and do whatever others are choosing, thinking, saying, and doing.

By the measure in which one abandons being a slave to the whims of others as well as one's own selfish, short-term whims, one grows in vertical liberty and autonomy. Actions chosen (1) deliberately rather than by drifting, (2) out of knowledge of and concern for oneself, others, the whole of creation, and the long-term good, and (3) in preference to values over satisfactions are responsible, moral actions. Each such act is a step in the right direction, but authentic autonomy, indeed moral conversion itself, is a life-long struggle requiring multiple repetitions of such acts. To advance in moral conversion one must discover and resist one's biases, one must grow in knowledge of one's community and one's world, one must keep scrutinizing one's motives and scales of value, and one must remain open to the criticism and the wisdom of one's community.⁴²⁰

Thus, genuine liberty or autonomy should not be confused with an egotistical disregard for one's neighbor. It is quite the opposite. Due to the shift from satisfactions

⁴¹⁸ *Method*, 240.

⁴¹⁹ "Existenz and Aggiornamento," 242; "Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious," 315.

⁴²⁰ *Method*, 240.

to values, from being concerned with what is good merely for oneself to what is good for the whole community, both in the short run and the long term, the authentic, morally converted, autonomous subject is “armed against bias,” egotistical and otherwise.⁴²¹ In fact, moral conversion is the proximate means for people “to keep themselves free of individual, group and general bias.”⁴²²

Finally, despite the significant measure we may grow in autonomy or in “open-eyed, deliberate self-control,” Lonergan warns that due to human limitations, we never reach complete autonomy or self-control:

We do not know ourselves very well; we cannot chart the future; we cannot control our environment completely or the influences that work on us; we cannot explore our unconscious and preconscious mechanisms. Our course is the night; our control is only rough and approximate; we have to believe and trust, to risk and dare.⁴²³

3.2.3. *Intellectual Conversion*

Intellectual conversion operates on the cognitive levels of understanding and judgment. It is a transformation of convictions about what is real and how we come to know the real. Typically we believe that the real is whatever we can experience, by which we mean whatever we can see, touch, taste, hear, or smell. How do you know that happened? I was there. I saw it. The real, according to this view, is what is “really out there,” or “the already-out-there-now-real.”⁴²⁴

“Already” refers to the orientation and dynamic anticipation of biological consciousness; such consciousness does not create but finds its environment.... “Out” refers to the extroversion of a consciousness that is aware, not of its own ground, but of objects distinct from itself. “There” and “now” indicate the spatial and temporal determinations of extroverted consciousness. “Real,” finally, is a subdivision within the field of the “already

⁴²¹ Ibid., 242.

⁴²² Ibid., 270.

⁴²³ “Existenz and Aggiornamento,” 242; “Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious,” 315.

⁴²⁴ *Insight*, 178, 181, 184, 449.

out there now”: part of that is mere appearance; but part is real; and its reality consists in its relevance to biological success or failure, pleasure or pain.⁴²⁵

To Lonergan, the persistent belief in the already-out-there-now-real is a damaging myth with fundamental implications for philosophy and indeed for all of human living:

The consequences of the myth are various. The naive realist knows the world mediated by meaning but thinks he knows it by looking. The empiricist restricts objective knowing to sense experience; for him, understanding and conceiving, judging and believing are merely subjective activities. The idealist insists that human knowing always includes understanding as well as sense; but he retains the empiricist’s notion of reality, and so he thinks of the world mediated by meaning as not real but ideal.⁴²⁶

A major problem with this myth is that if we think reality is simply what is sensed, we cannot account for the existence of such non-physical realities as love and friendship, God and sin, to say nothing of causality. Nor can we understand the world as conceived according to modern science, because Einstein’s quantum mechanics

removed from science the relevance of any image of particles, or waves, or continuous process. No less than his predecessors, the contemporary scientist can observe and experiment, inquire and understand, form hypotheses and verify them. But unlike his predecessors, he has to think of knowledge, of knowledge, not as taking a look, but as experiencing, understanding and judging; ... he has to think of the real, not as a part of the “already out there now,” but as the verifiable.⁴²⁷

Intellectual conversion is from these false views about reality and human knowing to the position Lonergan calls “critical realism.”⁴²⁸ The critical realist knows that reality is a world of meaning and value, of things that both can and cannot be sensibly experienced. S/he knows that knowing is by self-transcendence and is comprised of experiencing, understanding, and judging. Reality is the set of intelligible relations

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*, 276-77; cf., *Method*, 263-64.

⁴²⁶ *Method*, 238-39; cf., 76, 206. Lonergan criticizes the immediacy of naive realism as “animal knowing,” however, he sometimes uses this term to indicate a limited but legitimate, “immediate” human knowing that is transcended by a fuller human knowing that is enriched and “mediated by meaning” (*Insight*, 22, 439, 448; *Method*, 76-77).

⁴²⁷ *Insight*, 449-50.

⁴²⁸ *Method*, 239. For a related discussion on objectivity, see *Method*, 263-64 and *Insight*, 399-400, 404-09.

judged to actually exist. One who is intellectually converted has judged this to be true. S/he has undertaken a long process of attending to his/her own processes of coming to know, of understanding the process, and of making the existential self-judgment that, s/he can and does know the truth by a compound of actions involving sensing, imagining, questioning, understanding, conceiving, verifying, and judging.

By opening one's mind to the existence of non-physical realities, intellectual conversion can open the door to faith and thus to redemption. However, this typically works the other way around. Faith usually comes first, for "among the values discerned by the eye of love is the value of believing the truths taught by the religious tradition, and in such tradition and belief are the seeds of intellectual conversion."⁴²⁹

Moral conversion, too, is typically caused by religious conversion, for faith, "the eye of this [religious, unconditional] love reveals values in their splendor, while the strength of this love brings about their realization, and that is moral conversion."⁴³⁰ In a concrete individual, the three conversions can be obtained separately, or in various combinations. If all three are found in a person, the relation is of moral conversion subsuming intellectual, and religious subsuming intellectual and moral.

Marked by "high seriousness and a mature wisdom," as well as responsible dedication to the welfare of all humanity and indeed all creation, converted individuals are a "foundational reality." They are the standards of authentic humanity, the principles for the reversal of decline, for the healing and elevation of human progress. Converted persons are the foundation for the authentic community, and, as community, they are

⁴²⁹ Ibid., 243.

⁴³⁰ Ibid.

fundamental for the ongoing emergence of conversion.⁴³¹ Again, even among the converted, authenticity remains a dialectical development, for “the task of repentance and conversion is life-long.”⁴³² Fortunately, conversion is achieved not alone but in community.

3.3. A Redemptive Community

3.3.1. *Cosmopolis*

Typically in *Insight*, Lonergan credits progress to human intelligence as driven by the “detached and disinterested desire to know.” Surprisingly, however, he sometimes in this same work credits liberty. Rather than view this as an irreconcilable inconsistency, I would argue that liberty and intelligence are complementary, and both are necessary for progress.⁴³³ Good ideas can improve the situation, but there must liberty in the community for the ideas to arise, to be communicated, to be tested, to be implemented, to change the social situation, to be re-evaluated and corrected by new ideas. This process is the “wheel of progress,” and it must spin freely. If it is either halted or forced to spin, it can quickly turn into a “wheel of decline.”⁴³⁴ New ideas arise unpredictably and only under conditions of liberty on personal and local levels. Thus,

one might as well declare openly that all new ideas were taboo, as require that they be examined, evaluated, and approved by some hierarchy of officials and bureaucrats; for members of this hierarchy possess authority and power in inverse ratio to their familiarity with the concrete situations in which the new ideas emerge...⁴³⁵

⁴³¹ Ibid., 267-270.

⁴³² Ibid., 118.

⁴³³ *Insight*, 261. This interpretation is supported by *Method*’s higher synthesis of insight and liberty in the four levels of conscious intentionality or transcendental method: experience, understanding, judgment, and decision.

⁴³⁴ The terms “wheel of progress” and “wheel of decline” are found in “Healing and Creating in History,” 105.

⁴³⁵ *Insight*, 259.

If a community organized by bureaucratic hierarchy and control is not best at promoting progress and reversing decline, what type of community is? Lonergan does not champion any particular type of political or economic organization (though he does call for a critical synthesis of the predominant liberal and Marxist models).⁴³⁶ Rather, he focuses on a redemptive community that would motivate people on a *cultural* level more than attempting to engineer new social structures of technology, economy, and polity.

As mentioned in the above section on sin, Lonergan believes that “the social surd resides least of all in outer things and most of all in the minds and wills of men.”⁴³⁷ Thus, the problem of decline is first of all a challenge to transform human hearts and minds. Because of his conviction about humanity’s natural desire for God, Lonergan argues that the best way to transform hearts and minds is not through ideology but by promoting liberty and thought. A liberated and liberating culture provides a communal, collaborative context for a people to wonder, to reflect, to critique, and to deliberate in a way that at once satisfies their minds and speaks to their hearts. Consequently, if we are to meet the challenge of the longer cycle of decline, then we must do it, not so much by social structures “with their teeth in them,” but through the persuasive meanings and values of culture.⁴³⁸

“Cosmopolis” is Lonergan’s term, within *Insight*’s philosophical context, for the social unit that works on the level of culture to reverse the cycles of decline. Standing against the shorter cycle caused by group bias, cosmopolis “is neither class nor state.” It

⁴³⁶ Ibid., 266.

⁴³⁷ Ibid., 712.

⁴³⁸ Ibid., 261.

is “too universal to be bribed, too impalpable to be forced, too effective to be ignored.” Cosmopolis also is not a police force. It works through ideas and symbols. Force is instrumental at best and then no more than “residual and incidental.”⁴³⁹ Cosmopolis is not a group against others, nor an institution of enrolled members, a superstate ruling states, an academy endorsing ideas, or a court enforcing a legal code. Cosmopolis is not an organized body but the cultural embodiment of the unrestricted eros of the human spirit.

Considered from a theoretical standpoint, cosmopolis is not part of the absolutely supernatural order of grace. But in its concrete realization, cosmopolis will in all probability be made possible by the three conversions, for its members must be guarded against group bias in particular. And this is made possible by the expansive concern of religious conversion and charity.

The focus of its redemptive endeavor, however, is the counteraction of general bias and the longer cycle of decline that general bias can cause. If we recall, general bias is a negative temptation to which common sense is susceptible. Common sense is an indispensable specialization of consciousness that deals with everyday situations. Its focus on practicality can become a narrow-mindedness that evaluates a thing's or even a person's value based on its perceived immediate usefulness.⁴⁴⁰ The members of cosmopolis inhabit all the realms of meaning available to a culture: common sense, theory, interiority, and transcendence.⁴⁴¹ They are not against common-sense

⁴³⁹ Ibid., 263.

⁴⁴⁰ See section 2.2.4.

⁴⁴¹ See section 1.5.5.

practicality; rather they teach that “practicality is for man and not man for practicality,”⁴⁴² and that there is more to the value of a thing, a person, an artwork, an academic endeavor, etc., than its immediate usefulness.

“Delight and suffering, laughter and tears, joy and sorrow, aspiration and frustration, achievement and failure, wit and humor, stand not within practicality but above it.”⁴⁴³ To appeal to these areas of human life, cosmopolis enlists multiple means of communication: art and literature, theater and journalism, schools and universities, public opinion and “personal depth.”⁴⁴⁴ In particular, “education is the great means for transforming the human situation.”⁴⁴⁵ Education is key because it can transform hearts and minds at a time when they are most open to change. At the same time, human beings are not “pure intelligences,” so cosmopolis does not work merely through philosophy or other forms of scholarship. However, to counteract the short-term thinking of common sense, it relies heavily on the broad and long-term viewpoints of philosophy, science, and history.⁴⁴⁶

The work of cosmopolis to counteract decline is not easy. It is not all “sweetness and light, where sweetness means sweet to me, and light means light to me.” But its way is not entirely combative or countercultural. “It is by moving with that [general] bias than against it, by differing from it slightly rather than opposing it thoroughly, that one has the best prospect of selling books and newspapers, entertainment and education.”⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴² Ibid., 267

⁴⁴³ Ibid., 261.

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid., 264-66.

⁴⁴⁵ *Topics in Education*, 5.

⁴⁴⁶ *Insight*, 261-64,

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid., 266.

The way of cosmopolis, after all, is to transform hearts and minds, and thus to persuade and to educate, rather than to attempt to force people to conform and thus perhaps to breed resistance and *ressentiment*.⁴⁴⁸

3.3.2. *The Body of Christ*

Cosmopolis is a philosophical term for a community that operates on the level of culture. Its task is to combat decline and to liberate the natural creativity of the pure, unrestricted human desire for a transcendent fulfillment. Only implicitly, by its de facto function of reversing decline, may cosmopolis be categorized as redemptive. The body of Christ, however, is explicitly a redemptive community, since by definition it operates on the level of grace, both healing and elevating. According to Christian faith, the body of Christ is not simply *a* redemptive community but *the* redemptive community. For Lonergan it is “a concrete union of the divine Persons with one another and with man”⁴⁴⁹ or “a new society in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in which there is communicated to us personally, through the person of the Son and through the person of the Spirit, a participation of divine perfection, a participation of the order of truth and love that binds the three persons of the Blessed Trinity.”⁴⁵⁰

Human beings are social by nature. Our operations of knowing, valuing, choosing, loving, and acting, are, in the larger part, *co*-operations. In progress, one person’s insights and innovations set the conditions for the emergence of many more insights and innovations by many other persons. This true, in the reverse manner, for a

⁴⁴⁸ See note 326.

⁴⁴⁹ Bernard Lonergan, “The Mystical Body of Christ,” *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 20: *Short Papers* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 106.

⁴⁵⁰ *Topics in Education*, 68.

state of decline: one person's sins set negative conditions that increase the likelihood that others will sin. Given the social nature of human progress and decline, it is fitting that redemption be achieved not simply through isolated conversions but in community. Thus, Lonergan affirms, "just as there is human solidarity in sin with a dialectical descent deforming knowledge and perverting will, so there is a divine solidarity in grace which is the mystical body of Christ."⁴⁵¹

Lonergan devoted an entire talk to the subject of the body of Christ.⁴⁵² In it he states that because the body of Christ is a community with God, and because God is a mystery, the body too is a mystery and thus is not *fully* comprehensible to finite human minds.⁴⁵³ However, to explore the mystery of the body of Christ and to gain some fruitful understanding of it, he selects as "a guiding thread through the labyrinth of wealth, the single but basic and familiar theme of love."⁴⁵⁴

In the mystical body of Christ, divine and human persons are bound by love. First there is the love of the Eternal Father for the Eternal Son. Both are God, so this love is of God for God. Because this love is an infinite love for an infinite lovable-ness, this love is God too: God the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit. Second, there is the love of God the Father for the Son as human. The second person of the trinity possesses two natures, divine and human. But since he is one person, and love is for a person, the Father has a single love, and God's love for the Son as man is the same love as the Father's love for the Son as divine: it is an infinite love. Furthermore, because the Son adopted a human nature, the

⁴⁵¹ "Finality, Love, Marriage," 26.

⁴⁵² See note 449.

⁴⁵³ More on mystery and the human quest to understand mystery will be said early in the next chapter.

⁴⁵⁴ "The Mystical Body of Christ," 106.

infinite love of the Father for the Son, the Holy Spirit, is extended to all of humanity.

Thus,

the stupendous corollary of the Incarnation [is that b]ecause God became man, the love of God for God became the love of God for man. Because love is for a person, when God became man, when the Word was made Flesh, divine love broke the confines of divinity to love a created humanity in the way that God the Father loves God the Son.⁴⁵⁵

This extension of divine love through Christ is expressed in the theological doctrine that Christ's sanctifying grace is infinite. The divine love confers divine loveableness on the beloved creature.

The third love comprising the mystical body of Christ is the love Christ as human has for humanity. Lonergan writes movingly of this love. Here is just a taste:

It is the love of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the love of a human will, motivated by a human mind, operating through human senses, resonating through human emotions and feelings and sentiments, implemented by a human body with its structure of bones and muscles, flesh, its mobile features, its terrible capacities for pleasure and pain, for joy and sorrow, for rapture and agony. It is the love of the Good Shepherd, knowing his own, known by his own, and ready to lose his life for them [Jn 10:14-15]...⁴⁵⁶

Jesus' love is not calculating. It gives without measure and without hope for personal gain. "What is the use of living and dying for men who will not believe, or if they believe, do not love, or if they love only half-heartedly. Can love be love and not give all?"⁴⁵⁷ Christ lived to communicate God's love to us. For example, his baptism was not done so much for himself, in order to receive sanctifying grace, as in order that humanity might know the divine love extended to it. Christ's baptism was "an outside manifestation of an inward effect."⁴⁵⁸

⁴⁵⁵ Ibid., 107.

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid., 107-08.

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid., 108.

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid.

As discussed above, the Incarnation itself occasioned the extension of the Father's infinite love for the Son to all of humanity. To emphasize this effect, Lonergan devotes a distinct, fourth category to the Father's love for humanity. Christ prays for it when asking that all his may be *one*, as the Father and he are one, that all may be one *in* the Father and the Son, and that we may *know* the Father has loved us *as* the Father has loved the Son.⁴⁵⁹ The Father's love for humanity is the infinite love of the Holy Spirit. It is the occasion for its recipient to be "born again," to receive many graces and gifts, and to become an adopted daughter or son of God, a full heir to the reign of God.⁴⁶⁰

One of the gifts "diffused in our hearts by the Holy Ghost" is charity, the fifth and final love Lonergan examines in this context of the body of Christ.⁴⁶¹ Already we have identified charity as the love of God with one's whole heart, soul, mind, and strength that leads to love of oneself and love of one's neighbor. We have presented charity's role in undoing decline by promoting repentance of one's own sins and self-sacrificial love of neighbor that can undo decline.⁴⁶² Here Lonergan adds that the love of the Father, Son, and Spirit is received and made one's own in charity through the fellowship and sacraments of the church, such as baptism, reconciliation, and the Eucharist.⁴⁶³

Joined by this five-fold love, we are members of the body of Christ and begin "a new and higher life [that] is not lived in isolation."⁴⁶⁴ Human beings flourish to the extent that we are united with Christ. "He is the vine and we are the branches. As

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., 107, paraphrasing Jn. 17:11, 22-23.

⁴⁶⁰ Ibid., 109.

⁴⁶¹ Ibid., 110.

⁴⁶² Sections 1.5.1. and 3.2.1.1., above.

⁴⁶³ "The Mystical Body of Christ," 109, 111.

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid., 109.

branches wither and die, when separated from the vine, so are we without the life of grace, when separated from Christ. As branches flower and fructify when united fully with the vine, so too, do we, when united fully with Christ.”⁴⁶⁵ There is, however, a limit to the analogy. To some measure each human person has an existence, a freedom, and an accountability of her/his own.

The Body of Christ is the work primarily of God, particularly through the two missions of God to the world, the sending of the Spirit and the sending of the Son. Their works operate respectively as the “inner word” and the “outer word.” The Holy Spirit pours forth charity and other gifts in the “inner word of grace.” The Son is the principle for the outer word, that is Jesus Christ’s words and deeds expressed in human terms by his life, death, and, resurrection, and passed down in the narratives of the gospels, the ongoing fellowship of the church, and the authority of tradition and doctrine.⁴⁶⁶

These missions are not merely the effects of God on the world, but

a personal entrance of God himself into history, a communication of God to his people, the advent of God’s word into the world of religious expression. Such was the religion of Israel. Such has been Christianity. Then not only the inner word that is God’s gift of his love but also the outer word of the religious tradition comes from God.⁴⁶⁷

Due to its reception of the inner and the outer words of God, there is a kind of authority and authenticity to the church. However, Lonergan reminds us that Christians are “pilgrims,” still on the way. As a concrete group of human persons, the church is not entirely free from sin.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁶ See section 3.2.1., above, where the inner and outer words are discussed, as well as *Method*, 112-119, 298. In other contexts, such as *Topics in Education*

⁴⁶⁷ *Method*, 119.

Not only is there the progress of mankind but also there is development and progress within Christianity itself; and as there is development, so too there is decline; and as there is decline, there is also the problem of undoing it, of overcoming evil with the good not only in the world but also in the church.⁴⁶⁸

In addition, there are elements of redemption found in secular society:

Being in Christ Jesus is not tied down to place or time, culture or epoch. It is catholic with the catholicity of the Spirit of the Lord. Neither is it an abstraction that dwells apart from every place and time, every culture and epoch. It is identical with personal living, and personal living is always here and now...⁴⁶⁹

What matters is that members of the body of Christ receive and accept the sanctifying gifts of God's love and God's word given to all. What matters is that each person grow in religious conversion, in otherworldly being-in-love, and that this love is shared in a community with shared meanings and values. The body of Christ is about personal growth and growth in relationships, and these growths are not opposed, since "we grow in who we are through our relationships with others."⁴⁷⁰ The doctrine of the mystical Body of Christ teaches us that we are blessed to grow in relationship, indeed in friendship, not only with each other but also and most importantly with God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.⁴⁷¹ The doctrine of the mystical body of Christ teaches us that through these friendships a human person is blessed to cooperate in the redemption of her/his own soul as well as to collaborate in God's redemption of all creation.

Such growth, friendship, and collaboration are received and achieved not only through the gifts of God's healing and elevating grace, not only in threefold conversion, and not only in communion with a redemptive community that includes the holy Trinity,

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid., 291.

⁴⁶⁹ "Existenz and Aggiornamento," 250. See also, *Topics in Education*, 69.

⁴⁷⁰ "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer," *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1958-1965*, ed. R. Croken, F. Crowe, R. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 174. Cf. 180.

⁴⁷¹ Friendship with God will play a key role in the next chapter.

but, in particular, in *imitation* of Christ. Like Christ we are to preach the kingdom or reign of God, we are to pray and to work for increased knowledge and love of the good and the true, and we are even at times called to *overcome evil with good* through *self-sacrificial love*.⁴⁷²

Lonergan believes that this overcoming of evil through self-sacrificial love is the core of both the love of God's Spirit and the word of Jesus Christ. It is the heart of participation in the life of the Trinity through the mystical body of Christ. We must, like Christ, take up our own crosses.⁴⁷³ What this means, exactly, is much debated, and the debate is of tremendous significance, because the imitation of Christ, particularly Christ's work on the cross, is dangerous and complicated. A proper imitation requires faithful understanding of Christ's work. Such is the work of Lonergan's systematic soteriology, but this we leave to the next part.

⁴⁷² See *Method*, 291, where Lonergan cites Rom 12:21 on overcoming evil with good.

⁴⁷³ "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer," 181, with an uncited quote of Lk. 9:23, Mk. 8:34, or Mt. 16:24.

Conclusion

We have considered nature, sin, and grace in terms of progress, decline, and redemption. Within each chapter and each section the movement was from the basic to the complex, from basic metaphysical generalities to individual persons to human communities to communities in history. Progress, decline, and redemption account for the differences in human history. All three are operative simultaneously, but it is helpful to consider them individually. There is the natural thrust towards truth and goodness achieved in authentic self-transcendence and creative of a human good, i.e., human society progressing over time. However, there is also the evil thrust of sin and bias that causes the downward cycles and worsening situations of decline. Finally, there is the corrective vector of the absolutely supernatural, of grace converting persons, healing and elevating nature into participation in the divine love and life of the Trinity.

God created humanity with freedom, with the ability to choose or to deny value, goodness, love. But with this freedom arises the problem of sin and evil. To solve the problem, God is working in history in a way that does not destroy human freedom or the integrity of the world order. Rather, God is working in a way that is consonant with that order. God is working through a higher integration that shifts probabilities, from a tendency to do evil to a tendency to do good. This solution does not destroy human freedom, but works with it. The solution is a collaboration of divine love with human hearts, minds, and sensitivities. The solution works to transform those very human

hearts, minds, and sensitivities. But more than this, the solution effects a transformation of the evils of sin into a greater good. This is the focus of our next part.

PART 2. LONERGAN'S SOTERIOLOGY: UNDERSTANDING THE MYSTERY

The immediate purpose of the last part of this dissertation was to set the context for this part. We considered Lonergan's anthropology before his soteriology, because to understand a solution one must possess some understanding of the problem.¹ Having considered the problem of the world and in particular of humanity as infected by sin but also as graced by God, let us turn now to the divine solution to evil, focusing on Christ's passion and death on the cross. This is fitting, for, "It is by the death of Christ that we are saved. And our salvation through the death of Christ is reaffirmed continuously throughout the New Testament."²

This part examines the role of Jesus Christ's suffering and death in the redemption of the world.³ It takes as granted the fact *that* Christ's passion saves, and

¹ This is related to Lonergan's view (adapted from R.G Collingwood) that all statements are answers to questions, all questions arise in contexts, and to understand/appreciate a statement, one must understand/appreciate the question it answers and context in which the question arose. See *Method in Theology*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 164; "Philosophy and the Religious Phenomenon," *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980*, ed. R. Crocken, F. Crowe, R. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 404.; and "Metaphysics as Horizon," *Collection*, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1996), 202-221; and *The Way to Nicea* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), Translators Introduction and Ch. 1.

² Bernard Lonergan, "The Redemption," *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1958-1964*, ed. R. Crocken, F. Crowe, R. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 8. In affirming salvation through Christ's death, Lonergan is not denying the roles of the Father, of the Incarnation, of Christ's words and deeds, of the resurrection, of the Holy Spirit, or of the church.

³ For Lonergan, "redemption is the restoration of a fallen order.... God intended a restoration of the universe's good of order." Human sin caused the fall. Thus, Lonergan focuses on the redemption of human sinfulness and its negative consequences. Quoted text from p. 588 of Lonergan's *De Verbo Incarnato*, Third edition (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 1964). I rely on Charles Hefling's excellent translation, henceforth to be referred to as "*DVI* (trans., Hefling)." Unpublished at the time of this dissertation, Hefling's translation of theses 15-17 will be published as *Collected Works*, Vol. 9. For more

asks *how* it saves. The fact of salvation through Christ's passion is established as a doctrine of the church in the early Christian creeds.⁴ We seek to answer the question: How does Christ's passion—his suffering and death—save us from our sins? How does it function?

This method follows Lonergan's method, for he too began with church teaching on the fact of redemption and then sought to understand how it works.⁵ In presenting Lonergan's soteriology, this part begins with his general views on whether it is possible to understand redemption and if so, what type of understanding can be gained. The remainder of the part examines Lonergan's conclusions, or his actual understanding of redemption. Ultimately, the hope is not simply to understand Lonergan's understanding, but through Lonergan to learn something true, edifying, and fruitful about the salvific effect of redemption and, in particular, of Christ's cross: what it achieves in us, how it achieves its end, and how we are to participate in the fulfillment of that end.

The main texts examined are: (1) "The Redemption,"⁶ from a lecture given on September 25, 1958 at the Thomas More Institute in Montreal. Lonergan delivered the lecture shortly after he finished teaching the theology of redemption for the third time at the Gregorian University as part of his Christology course, "*De Verbo incarnato*." Lonergan had also just finished writing six chapters of a rough draft for a book on

information on the work as a whole, please see Frederick Crowe, *Christ and History*, Ch. 6. *De Verbo Incarnato*.

⁴ Lonergan cites Henry Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*, edited by C. Bannwart, 2, 6, 54, 86; and the Denzinger edition edited by A. Schönmetzer, 11, 30, 125, 150; henceforth referred to as DB and DS. *DVI*, 553-59.

⁵ As mentioned in the introduction, this dissertation is directly an effort in indirect discourse, namely to interpret Lonergan, and indirectly an effort at direct discourse, or systematic understanding of church doctrine. See note three in the introduction.

⁶ See note 2, above.

redemption.⁷ (2) The final, 1964 version of a textbook Lonergan wrote for his Christology course at the Pontifical Gregorian University: *The Incarnate Word* (*De Verbo incarnato*), particularly theses fifteen through seventeen.

These texts were written relatively early in Lonergan's career. As a consequence, they suffer from a lack of the mature Lonergan's sense of historicity.⁸ This is most pronounced in *De Verbo incarnato*, because as a course textbook it needed to conform to the "manual" style of proving theses, then standard at the Gregorianum. However, while Lonergan himself criticized with a great passion this style and the theological method that it resulted from,⁹ he maintained that some of the content of those writings remained "a permanently valid achievement."¹⁰ I will supplement these two main texts with other writings of Lonergan to make up for this shortcoming.

⁷ Ibid., editors' note, 1. This rough draft was discovered at Lonergan's death. The dating is uncertain. Cf. Frederick E. Crowe, *Christ and History* (Ottawa, Canada: Novalis, 2005), Ch. 9, particularly pages 99-100, 124.

⁸ In some ways, Lonergan's interest in history is traceable to his early years of concern with the philosophy of history. In 1955, Lonergan decided to abandon the ahistorical method of the "proof." But the full development and integration of Lonergan's historical consciousness took many more years. Crowe, *Christ and History*, 20, 76.

⁹ Cf. "Theology in Its New Context," "The Future of Thomism," and "The Future of Christianity" in *A Second Collection*, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1996); as well as Crowe, *Christ and History*, Ch. 7, "Critique of Scholasticism."

¹⁰ The phrase is Charles Hefling's, but Lonergan said that while the situation was "hopelessly antiquated" some of his developments were "permanently valid" in "An interview with Fr. Bernard Lonergan," *A Second Collection*, 211-213. Quotes from 212. Hefling's phrase comes from his essay, "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement: Lonergan on Christ's Satisfaction," *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* (1992): 51.

Chapter 1. Understanding Redemption? The Type of Intelligibility Sought

1.1. Mystery

Redemption is a mystery, and one would think that by definition a mystery, at least in the theological sense, cannot be understood. Lonergan defines mystery most generally as the “known unknown.”¹¹ We know *that* something mysterious exists, but we do not understand *what* this something is or *how* it exists. By our nature, human persons are oriented to mystery. We want to pull back the curtain. And though we make advances, much remains mysterious. Each door opened reveals ten new doors. “Though the field of mystery is contracted by the advance of knowledge, it cannot be eliminated from human living. There always is the further question.”¹² Ideally, all of creation is knowable. It is finite. But even if a person could comprehend all of creation, her/his natural desire to know would not be satisfied. Even without knowing all of creation, the human mind transcends creation in its questions about a creator. Ultimately, there arises the known unknown of “transcendent reality.”¹³

In “The Redemption,” Lonergan distinguishes, but does not separate, three senses of the word “mystery” that are applicable to the transcendent reality of redemption: theological, pious, and a hidden plan.

The first, “the theologian’s sense” of mystery denotes “a truth that we cannot

¹¹ *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 569.

¹² *Ibid.*, 570.

¹³ *Ibid.* See also 663 and 674-80, as well as *Method*, 101-03.

adequately understand in this life.”¹⁴ The redemption is precisely this type of mystery, however, the apparent foolishness of seeking to understand redemption is diminished by the word “adequately.” To settle the question of whether or not mysteries can be understood, let us backtrack from the truths “we cannot adequately understand in this life” and consider truth in general.

Lonergan distinguishes two types of truth. On the one hand are truths that can be known by “the natural light of reason.” Among these, for example, is the fact that God exists.¹⁵ On the other hand are truths that completely surpass natural human capacities. If these truths are to be known by humanity, they must be revealed by God and accepted in faith.¹⁶ These are the truths that are mysteries in “the theological sense.” One example is the essence of God as Trinitarian.

While theological mysteries cannot be known by reason, there is the possibility that “[r]eason illuminated by faith, when it inquires diligently, piously, soberly” may reach “with God’s help some extremely fruitful understanding of the mysteries.”¹⁷ Such fruitful understanding is the understanding we seek in this part. As “some” fruitful understanding, it is never a comprehensive or “adequate” understanding. “For the divine mysteries by their very nature so exceed created intellect, that, even given in revelation

¹⁴ “The Redemption,” 24.

¹⁵ Some of the truths that are knowable through the natural light of reason, but are difficult to discover in this way, have been revealed by God. These Lonergan calls “revealed truths” as distinct from “revealed mysteries.” *Method*, 322-23.

¹⁶ *Method*, 320-21. Lonergan cites DS, 3004, 3008, 3009, 3015. Some of the truths revealed by God and accepted in faith are not mysteries. God in wisdom and love has revealed some truths to us that could, with difficulty, be known by reason. But mysteries are those truths that *must* be revealed and accepted in faith, if they are to be known.

¹⁷ *Method*, 320-21, 321. Lonergan paraphrases the documents of Vatican I. He cites DS 3016. See also *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 503 and 509, which cite DS 3016 as well as DB 1796.

and accepted by faith, they remain as it were wrapped in the veil of faith.”¹⁸

The second sense of “mystery” pertains not directly to theology but to Christian piety. For this sense, Lonergan primarily has in mind the mysteries of the life of Christ as meditated upon in the mysteries of the rosary.¹⁹ To say that they are the object of Christian piety is not to say that they are in any way simple, for “the mysteries of the life of our Lord that we contemplate, through sensibility and human feeling” treat reality in its complexity: the intelligibility of nature, the unintelligible elements of sin, and the transcendently intelligible elements of grace and God, as well as how these stand in relation to each other.²⁰

Lonergan’s final sense of “mystery” is perhaps the most significant for understanding redemption. This is mystery in the sense of the “secret counsel” (*secretum consilium*), “hidden wisdom,” or “hidden plan” of a king.²¹ This interpretation is scripturally founded. When the New Testament writers speak of mystery, they are using a “Greek word [that] has been used to translate a Hebrew conception of Persian origin.”²² In all three languages, “mystery” means something like the secret plan of a wise king. This, Lonergan believes, is the primary sense in which the New Testament authors use the word mystery. “The mystery hidden through all the ages and now made plain is mystery in the sense of ‘secret counsel.’ . . . ‘Mystery’ means the secret counsel of a king,

¹⁸ *Method*, 320-21.

¹⁹ “The Redemption,” 24.

²⁰ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 557.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 456, 583; “The Redemption,” 24-25.

²² “The Redemption,” 24-25. Lonergan cites Ernst Vogt, “*Mysteria* in textibus Qumran,” *Biblica* 37 (1956): 247-257; Karl Prümm, “Zur Phänomenologie des paulinischen Mysterion und dessen seelischer Aufnahme. Eine Übersicht,” *Biblica* 37 (1956): 135-161 and “Mystère,” *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément, ed. L. Pirot, A. Robert, and H. Cazelles (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1960): cols 1-226. Cf. *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 583.

and it is in that sense, fundamentally, that it is employed in the New Testament.”²³

In affirming this secret counsel or wise and hidden plan of God, Lonergan means both that God intends a particular *order* for creation and that God has a *plan* for its realization. Thus, Lonergan distinguishes between redemption as an *end* and redemption as a *means*.²⁴ As an end or a goal, God’s plan is an ordering of all of creation according to divine wisdom and goodness. This is what the New Testament calls the “kingdom” or the “reign” of God. The carrying out of this plan by Christ is redemption as a means. The plan has been initiated, and, consequently, the current state of the world is a mixture of order and disorder, a composite of progress, decline, and redemption.

Not only initiated, God’s “hidden plan, ‘kept secret for long ages ... is now disclosed ... to all nations.’”²⁵ In Christ, God’s hidden plan is revealed. The secret counsel is now good news. It is the “fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham” and the realization of God’s reign. It comes through an opposition of “justice and grace and life to law, sin, wrath, and death,” It is concretely “illustrated,” “applied,” and “realized” not simply in words and promises, but in deeds and events surrounding the God-man, Jesus Christ. Thus, mystery in this sense is the divine plan to unite all things in Christ.²⁶

Our God, conceived as a wise king, has a plan to redeem the world and to reestablish his reign. It is a plan to put a broken creation into order or right relationships. Its wisdom is so great that it will make ultimate sense of the sin and suffering of this world. This plan is a mystery that transcends human reason, but it has been revealed through Christ to all humanity. As Christians, we hold this in faith, and we can meditate upon it in the mysteries of Christ’s incarnation, life, death and resurrection. Furthermore, with reason illuminated by faith, we may seek to gain some measure of fruitful but not

²³ “The Redemption,” 24-25.

²⁴ Ibid., 446, 459-464.

²⁵ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 583, quoting Rom 16:25-26.

²⁶ Ibid., 584, citing Eph. 1:9-10. The text is, “He has made known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure that he set forth in Christ, as a plan for the fullness of time, to gather up all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth” (New Revised Standard Version).

comprehensive understanding of God's mysterious plan.

1.2. The Type of Intelligibility Sought

For Lonergan, “what is grasped when one understands is named an intelligibility.”²⁷ What type of understanding can we have of God's plan of redemption? What type of intelligibility does it have? These are the questions this section seeks to answer. They are important because misunderstandings of how redemption works are caused by underlying mistakes about its general intelligibility, as we shall see throughout this chapter.

Lonergan discusses five aspects of redemption's intelligibility.²⁸

1.2.1. *Fittingness, not Necessity*

At least since Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109), there has been a tradition of arguing that Christ's suffering and death was necessary for redemption.²⁹ At a time when Christian faith in the Incarnation was being challenged as irrational by those he calls “infidels,” Anselm sought to explain why God became human. Though his primary question was the Incarnation, Anselm grounded his answer on a position regarding redemption. In the preface to *Cur Deus Homo?*, Anselm states his intention to “prove by *absolute* reasons, the *impossibility* that any person should be saved without him [Christ,

²⁷ “The Redemption,” 8.

²⁸ Lonergan presents these five aspects in “The Redemption” in the same order that follows here.

²⁹ Ibid. See *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 560-63. In this section, our focus is distinguishing necessity from fittingness as type of intelligibility, but in a following section on satisfaction we will consider the negative consequences of holding Christ's passion as necessary as well as the extent to which this position is attributable to Anselm.

the Incarnation].”³⁰ Anselm argued that if humanity was to be saved, then it was *necessary* for God to become human.³¹

The method of proving truths through absolute, necessary reasons was discussed above in our sections on classicism and determinism.³² It arose from a mistaken effort to generalize Aristotle’s ideal definition of science, and gradually it pervaded scholarly pursuits in fields from mathematics and physics to psychology and philosophy.³³ This obsession with necessity marked the work of many later scholastic Catholic theologians and the early Protestant reformers. Lonergan notes that a negative consequence of this is that many theologians “flatly affirmed that God in his justice could not possibly forgive the sins of mankind, unless Christ became man and suffered and died.”³⁴

Against this Lonergan asserts:

The Catholic tradition on the necessity of redemption by Christ is clear and uniform. St. Augustine flatly stated that there were *many other ways* in which God could redeem man apart from the suffering and death of Christ. The same view was repeated by Peter Lombard, whose *Sentences* were the basic text in theology for about three or four centuries. It was repeated by St. Thomas and Scotus and subsequently by all theologians.³⁵

Lonergan’s argument against the use of necessity in soteriology hinges on the distinction between three types of necessity: absolute necessity, conditional or hypothetical necessity, and fittingness. Only God is absolutely necessary. All of creation is the result of God’s free decision. As a whole and in all its parts, creation did not have

³⁰ Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo?* in *Basic Writings*, trans. S.N. Deane (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1998) 191, emphasis added.

³¹ In particular by an “adequate satisfaction.” *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 560.

³² Part 1, section 1.2. See in particular footnote 20.

³³ *Method*, 279-81.

³⁴ “The Redemption,” 8.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 8-9, emphasis added. The editor’s footnote indicates that Lonergan probably relied on Jean Rivière’s *Le Dogme de la Rédemption: Essai d’étude historique* (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1905).

to be.³⁶ Because of this, all relations within creation are governed, at most, by conditional or hypothetical necessity. For example, *if* one wishes to live, *then* one must eat. Hypothetical necessity, according to Lonergan, is the type of necessity that Anselm and others championed: *if* humanity was to be saved, *then* it was necessary for God to become human, to suffer, and to die.

In contrast, Lonergan maintains that God's redemption of humanity through the Incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of Christ is neither absolutely nor hypothetically necessary. Rather, it was fitting. Lonergan illustrates fittingness with an example from Thomas Aquinas. Thomas distinguishes between two types of necessity when relating ends and means:

One is the necessity of that without which an end is impossible, the necessity of food for maintaining life. The other is the necessity of that without which an end would not be so well or so appropriately achieved, the necessity of a horse for making a journey. [Thus] he affirms that the Incarnation was necessary for the restoration of the human race – necessary, not for there to be a restoration, but for a *better* and more *appropriate* restoration.³⁷

Applying Thomas's categories of fittingness to Anselm's question about the Incarnation, we might ask: Why is the Incarnation fitting? How does it make the restoration of the human race better and more appropriate? And, since Lonergan would extend fittingness to Christ's passion, we can ask: Why is Christ's passion fitting? How does it make human redemption better and more appropriate? These are the main questions for this entire part. Let it suffice for now to affirm that redemption by Christ's incarnation and passion are not necessary, but fitting. They are not the only way God

³⁶ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 573. See also *Insight*, 680-87.

³⁷ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 565, emphasis added. Fittingness was a relatively early interest for Lonergan and the topic of a short essay. See Crowe, *Christ and History*, 65-68.

could have chosen to redeem humanity, but they constitute “a better and more appropriate restoration” (as above). From a multitude of possible means to save the human race, Christ’s incarnation, life, death, and resurrection constitute the wisest way, the best way, the way chosen by God in infinite wisdom and goodness.³⁸

1.2.2. A Dynamic Intelligibility

Redemption’s intelligibility is not a matter of necessity, nor is it static or “a matter of deductive” thought.³⁹ Rather, it is dynamic and a matter of dialectical thought. We may recall that Lonergan defined dialectic as “a concrete unfolding of linked but opposed principles of change.”⁴⁰ In redemption, the primary linked but opposed principles are death and resurrection. Throughout scripture, this theme of death and resurrection “takes many forms and is constantly returning.”⁴¹

How do these dynamic, linked principles of death and resurrection unfold concretely? Lonergan affirms that “the fundamental element” in the dialectical intelligibility of redemption is “a reversal of roles.”⁴² According to the books of Genesis and Wisdom as well as Paul’s letter to the Romans, death is the penalty for sin.⁴³ But death does not remain simply the penalty, the wages, or the consequence of sin. Through the cross, death becomes the means of salvation, of new life in the resurrection. The intelligibility of redemption is an intelligibility of transformation.

³⁸ More will be said on the connection between fittingness and divine wisdom.

³⁹ “The Redemption,” 9.

⁴⁰ *Insight*, 242; quoted previously in Ch. 1, ft. 1.

⁴¹ “The Redemption,” 9.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ “In the book of Genesis, we read that God said to Adam when forbidding him to eat of the fruit of the tree, ‘On whatever day thou eatest thereof, thou shall die’ (2.17). Death is presented in the book of Genesis and in the book of Wisdom as the penalty for sin. The same doctrine is repeated by St. Paul in Romans 5.12: ‘By one man sin entered into the world and by sin death.’ And again in chapter 6, verse 23, ‘The wages of sin are death’” (*Ibid.*).

However, this transformation does not work in the simple, immediate manner that was expected at the time of Christ. Redemption is “not deductive” in that it is not a simple matter of immediately applying general rules of justice to the world: “They were awaiting a Messiah that would transform, in the twinkling of an eye, the whole human situation. The wicked would be punished, and the just would triumph, in this world.”⁴⁴

Redemption works dialectically in that sin remains, and death as the penalty of sin remains. But in Christ they become steps on the way to resurrection and redemption. “That means that conditions in the world continue despite the advent of the Messiah, but their very continuance becomes the means by which we proceed to eternal life.”⁴⁵

1.2.3. Incarnate Intelligibility

Redemption is not an abstraction or simply an idea. Redemption is an event in this concrete world and in this actually occurring history. “It exploits all the subtle relations that hold between body and mind, between flesh and spirit. Christ crucified is a symbol of endless meaning, and it is not merely a symbol but also a real death.”⁴⁶

Christ’s act on the cross involves transforming sin and death into many goods, such as satisfaction and communication. Without discussing these things thoroughly here, let us keep in mind that Christ’s work of redemption involves human persons in the whole of their being. It involves mental, volitional, and physical operations; social and historical dimensions; beliefs and feelings; love in all its richness; interpersonal relations

⁴⁴ “The Redemption,” 10. Lonergan does not explicitly state what he means by redemption (not) being “a matter of deductive” thought. Nor does he state the significance of the then-current messianic expectations at the time of Christ. I believe the latter is the illustration of the former in that the various false messianic expectations demonstrate that the redemption is not something that can be deduced.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

in their complexities; and friendship. Redemption as incarnate “resides in the love Christ manifested to us and the effects of that love on us.”⁴⁷

We cannot come to understand the redemption merely by an act of the intellect. It comes to us in our whole being, in our physicality, in our sensing, inquiring, understanding, judging, and deciding. It comes to us in community and in history. It comes through the Word and the Spirit. We receive it in the manner of “the way from below upwards” and in the manner “from above downwards.”⁴⁸

1.2.4. A Complex Intelligibility

To illustrate the complexity of redemption, Lonergan borrows from higher mathematics, which makes use of many types of numbers—rational and irrational, real and imaginary. These numbers must be clearly distinguished, but they can be used harmoniously.

Just as math includes real and imaginary numbers, so redemption includes the intelligibility of nature, the unintelligibility of sin, and “the transcendent intelligibility of God meeting the unintelligibility of sin.”⁴⁹

We have covered Lonergan’s thought on the intelligibility of nature in the first chapter. This is primarily the world operating according to emergent probability and humanity (in all its compoundness) as governed by but to some degree directing processes of emergent probability.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 14.

⁴⁸ Relatively: experience, understanding, judgment, and decision and decision, judgment, understanding, experience – as covered in Ch. 1 of this dissertation, particularly sections 1.4 and 1.5.

⁴⁹ “The Redemption,” 12.

In agreement with traditional Catholic theology, Lonergan judges sin to be unintelligible. There is no reason why people sin. Sin is a failure to act according to the truth and goodness that humans seek by nature. Choosing falsehood and evil does not make sense when scrutinized. One may rationalize a sinful choice with pretense or excuse, but there are no real reasons for it.

God is supremely intelligible in Godself, but to us, God's intelligibility transcends all that we can comprehend, even aided by the supernatural light of faith.

Soteriology must account for all of these, for progress, decline, and redemption. These elements must be distinguished, yet they must also be used together in the quest to understand how and why God chose to redeem the world in the manner God did indeed choose.

1.2.5. Multiple Intelligibility

Lonergan's final general remark on the intelligibility of redemption cautions against seeking to fit redemption "into some single formula, some neat reason."⁵⁰ When seeking to understand redemption, it is best to consider it from multiple viewpoints. The church has a long history with theologians coming up with many different ways of understanding Christ's work. Anselm's thought on satisfaction is an example of "the tendency to try to reduce everything to a single formula."⁵¹ Lonergan holds up Thomas as an example of considering multiple points of view: merit, satisfaction, redemption, sacrifice, and efficient causality.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 13.

⁵¹ Ibid.

Despite his caution against the temptation to fit all the aspects of redemption into a single formula, Lonergan does think it is good to hold as an ideal the search for a unified understanding. “Anyone who understands grasps many objects in a single view.”⁵² This is the work of the wisdom we seek, to order all things.⁵³ It is possible that Lonergan thought he had achieved a unified view of redemption in his “Law of the Cross.”⁵⁴ In his 1958 essay, “The Redemption,” Lonergan both cautioned against seeking a single view and invited this search. At the end of this essay Lonergan writes that the way to “move towards a total view” is by “the fundamental category... the word *mystery*,” which he then explains means primarily God’s wise, hidden plan.⁵⁵ A few years later, in *The Incarnate Word*, Lonergan devotes the final chapter to “Understanding the Mystery.” The chapter’s main theorem has been called “the Law of the Cross” and the sense of the chapter is that this law is a single view, an understanding of the mystery, which is defined as a “hidden plan.” Furthermore, Lonergan calls the Law of the Cross, “the intrinsic intelligibility of redemption” and “the essence of redemption.”⁵⁶

Let us emphasize, however, that Lonergan consistently maintains that his understanding, even that contained in the Law of the Cross, was not perfect or comprehensive. Redemption is a mystery that we cannot understand “adequately,” but only “fruitfully.” In *De Verbo incarnato*, Lonergan refers to this understanding as

⁵² *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 565. Lonergan directs us to his work *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, ed. David Burrell (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967), 52. We treat understanding in Ch. 1 of this dissertation, particularly section 1.3.1.

⁵³ Lonergan states this frequently, such as in *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 566 and 579.

⁵⁴ Such is the claim in the editors’ note 26, “The Redemption,” 14.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁵⁶ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 576-77.

“imperfect and analogical.”⁵⁷ The Law of the Cross may be first among many analogies, and perhaps the overarching one, but I believe the many analogies remain valid and all remain imperfect. Our next section focuses on just what is this “imperfect and analogical understanding.”

1.3. An Analogical Understanding

So far we have considered redemption as mystery and intelligibility. We have indicated that while redemption is a mystery that cannot be understood comprehensively by the created human intellect, reason illuminated by faith can gain some measure of fruitful understanding, i.e. some insight into its intelligibility. The intelligibility of redemption is also a mystery in the sense of God’s hidden plan, a free act of divine will. As such it is not necessary, but wise, good, and fitting. In addition, its intelligibility is dynamic, incarnate, complex, and multiple.

Now we ask how reason illuminated by faith is to gain fruitful understanding of the fitting, dynamic, etc. intelligibility of redemption. Is there a particular tool that the theologian uses in this quest? Lonergan’s answer to this question relies again on the statements of Vatican I. Paraphrasing the fourth chapter of the *Dogmatic Constitution concerning the Catholic Faith*, Lonergan writes that such fruitful understanding of mystery “rests on the analogy of things known naturally and on the interconnection of the mysteries with one another and with man’s last end.”⁵⁸

Fundamental to this project is the first part, “the analogy of things known naturally.” What is an analogy? Basically it is a comparison of two things that share a

⁵⁷ Ibid., 565.

⁵⁸ *Method*, 321, citing DS 3016 (DB 1796). See also *Method*, 132.

likeness. Typically analogy is used to understand a new or a difficult thing through its likeness to a something familiar or already understood. Furthermore, while an analogy shares the use of likeness with metaphors, analogies in Lonergan's usage means a controlled, proportionate likeness. For example, as the soul is the principle for natural operations of questioning and understanding, so sanctifying grace is the principle for the supernatural operations of faith, hope, and charity.⁵⁹

Analogies are particularly useful in theology, because God and the divine mysteries are beyond created intellect. Humans cannot understand and express the essences of these things comprehensively, exactly, or univocally. The way of negation, or denial, is open to us in discussing the divine mysteries. For example, we may state that God is *not* a body among bodies. Negation is helpful for preventing errors, but humans desire positive understanding. Traditionally, this is obtained in Christian theology through likeness. For example, when scripture speaks of God as a rock (Ps. 18:2, etc.), it does not mean that God is literally a rock, but that God is *like* a rock in being dependable. Metaphors, similes, and analogies are used to demonstrate likeness. Analogy goes beyond the simple but wild⁶⁰ comparison of metaphor and simile to a more extended and controlled comparison.⁶¹

When seeking to understand the divine mysteries, an "analogy from things known naturally" is helpful. As Lonergan writes, "Anyone who understands grasps many

⁵⁹ See Michael Stebbins, *The Divine Initiative: Grace, World Order, and Human Freedom in the Early Writings of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 30.

⁶⁰ A person who hears that God is a rock or is like a rock may come to many different and perhaps harmful conclusions, such as that God does not care.

⁶¹ Perhaps the best-known example is the psychological analogy of Augustine proposed in his *The Trinity* and developed in complicated ways by, among other theologians, Thomas Aquinas in the first part of his *Summa* (Questions 27-43) and Lonergan in the entirety of his *Verbum*.

objects in a single view. For getting this grasp in difficult cases, an analogy drawn from simpler ones is a big help.”⁶²

Let us turn now to Lonergan’s imperfect, analogical understanding of the mystery of redemption, of God’s wise plan for salvation as it is carried out in the passion of Christ.

⁶² *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 565.

Chapter 2. Redemption in the New Testament: Basic Analogies

In the preceding chapter, we set out the type of understanding sought: fruitful and analogical but not comprehensive understanding of God's wise and fitting plan. The primary text for the first chapter was Lonergan's essay, "The Redemption." While we will continue to refer to it, we now focus our attention on the final three chapters or "theses" of *The Incarnate Word*. The first is "Thesis 15: Redemption in the New Testament." It accumulates "the teaching of the New Testament" or, perhaps more correctly, what the church affirms in official doctrines as the "facts" of redemption.⁶³ Theses 16 and 17 constitute Lonergan's efforts as a systematic theologian to understand these defined truths.⁶⁴

Scripture is a privileged and primary source in the life and thought of the church. However, scripture itself represents the attempts by different people living in particular contexts to understand the mysterious events of Christ's incarnation, birth, life, death, and resurrection. While inspired by the Spirit and granted the knowledge of faith, the authors of the New Testament were themselves seeking to make sense of Jesus of Nazareth, Jesus the Christ.⁶⁵ Their understanding and their expressions of their understanding were to

⁶³ Ibid., 445, 447. Although Lonergan entitles the chapter "Redemption in the New Testament," all statements of truth are drawn from both scripture and doctrine.

⁶⁴ See *Method* Chs. 12, "Doctrines," and 13, "Systematics," on systematic theology's role of interpreting defined, doctrinal truth. Particularly helpful is p. 325, where Lonergan distinguishes between understanding *data*, as done in the functional specialty "Interpretation," and understanding *facts* or *truths*, the task of the specialty "Systematics."

⁶⁵ See Lonergan's 1975 lecture, "Christology Today: Methodological Reflections" published in *A Third Collection* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1985), 80-81. Here Lonergan discusses the effects of modern historical scholarship on biblical studies. With the shift in history conceived as "precritical belief

some degree analogical or metaphorical. This chapter will present Lonergan's discussion in thesis 15 of these scriptural analogies, which is why in the current chapter's title I have added the subtopic, "Basic Analogies," to Lonergan's title for thesis 15, "Redemption in the New Testament."

Thesis 15 states:

Redemption denotes not only an end but also a mediation: a price that has been paid, Christ the Mediator's vicarious suffering and death for sinners and on account of sins, the sacrifice offered by our High Priest in his own blood, meritorious obedience, the power of the risen Lord, and the eternal Priest's intercession.⁶⁶

The thesis is primarily a list of basic analogies: redemption, price paid, vicarious suffering and death, sacrifice, meritorious obedience, risen Lord's power, and eternal Priest's intercession. They are all authoritatively defined ways of understanding how God has indeed chosen in wisdom and love to save the human race through his Son, Jesus Christ. These ways are not competitive, but rather they "illuminate and complement" one another.⁶⁷

2.1. Redemption: As Word, End, and Mediation

2.1.1. The Word, Redemption

In "The Redemption," Lonergan writes that the New Testament includes two traditions or contexts, or traditions, for considering what we mean by the word

in testimony" to "critical understanding of evidence," scripture is treated as *inspired* in the sense of presenting "evidence of the *faith* of the early church." (Italics added.) Faith, for Lonergan, is the supernatural virtue that is a knowing born of religious love, poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit, as we saw in part 1, section 3.2.1.2. See also Crowe, *Christ and History*, 76 and 150, where he discusses Lonergan's long transition from the precritical to a more critical view.

⁶⁶ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 446. The original Latin: "Redemptio non solum finem dicit sed etiam mediationem, solutum nempe pretium, vicarium Christi mediatoris passionem et mortem propter peccata et pro peccatoribus, sacrificium a Pontifice nostro in suo sanguine oblatum meritoriam obedientiam, resuscitati Domini virtutem, et aeterni Sacerdotis intercessionem" (*DVI*, 446).

⁶⁷ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 471.

“redemption.”⁶⁸ The first comes from the Hebrew tradition presented in the Old Testament or the Hebrew Bible. It discusses redemption in the Hebrew terms: “*pādāh* and *pidyôn*, *gā’al* and *ge’ullah*, *kipper* and *kofer*.”⁶⁹ The second, the New Testament context comes from “a pagan marketplace and the ancient practice of buying and selling slaves and captives.”⁷⁰ In the Hebrew or Old Testament context, redemption means deliverance *from* one’s enemies and one’s sinfulness *for* social tranquility and personal holiness. In contrast, in the context of the pagan marketplace, redemption focuses on a financial transaction: the payment of a ransom or a price in exchange for goods.

In “The Redemption” Lonergan considers both aspects together under the simple heading of “redemption” – one of “the traditional five aspects [of Christ’s work] enumerated by St. Thomas.”⁷¹ In thesis 15 of *The Incarnate Word*, Lonergan allots a separate section each to redemption in the sense of (1) deliverance from sin and enemies for holiness and tranquility, and (2) a commercial transaction. Here we follow Lonergan’s presentation in *The Incarnate Word*, providing separate sections for Hebrew deliverance and for the pagan commercial transaction as, respectively, “Redemption” and “Paying a Price.”

In thesis 15, Lonergan writes that in the New Testament the English “redemption” is a translation of the Vulgate’s Latin, *redemptio*, which translates the original Greek words “*lytron*: Mk 10:45, Mt 20:28. *antilytron*: 1 Tm 2:6. *lytrôsis*: Lk 1:68, 2:38; Heb

⁶⁸ “The Redemption,” 18. Lonergan relies on a contemporary biblical scholar, Stanislaus Lyonnet and his works “De notione emptionis seu acquisitionis,” *Verbum Domini* 36 (1958): 257-69; De peccato et redemptione, vol. 2, *De vocabulario redemptionis* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1960): 49-66.

⁶⁹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 456. Cf. “The Redemption,” 17.

⁷⁰ “The Redemption,” 18.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 14.

9:12. *apolytrôsis*: Lk 21:28; Rom 3:24, 8:23; 1 Cor 1:30; Eph 1:7, 14, 4:30; Heb 9:15; (Heb 11:35). *lytrousthai*: Lk 24:21; Ti 2:14. *lytrôtês*: Acts 7:35.”⁷² The Septuagint version of the Hebrew scriptures uses *lytron* and its cognates to translate the aforementioned original Hebrew words *pâdâh* (used in the context of Israel’s Exodus from Egypt), *gâ’al* (used principally for deliverance from Babylon), and *kipper* (employed mainly for liberation from sin).⁷³

“Deliverance” is Lonergan’s preferred English translation of these terms. In support of this choice, Lonergan cites the canticle of Zachary in Luke 1:68-79:

Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel; he has visited his people, and wrought their *redemption*. He has raised up a scepter of salvation for us among the prosperity of his servant David... He had sworn an oath to our father Abraham, that he would enable us to live without fear in his service, *delivered from the hand of our enemies, passing all our days in holiness*, and approved in his sight... And thou, my child [John the Baptist], wilt be known for a prophet of the most High, going before the Lord, to clear his way for him; thou wilt make known to his people the salvation that is to *release them from their sins*. Such is the merciful kindness of our God, which has bidden him to come to us, like a dawning from on high, to give light to those who live in darkness, in the shadow of death, and to *guide our feet into the way of peace*.⁷⁴

When the New Testament authors attempted to express their faith in what God was doing in Christ, they reached back to their Hebrew roots to the terms *pâdâh*, *gâ’al*, and *kipper*, expressed in Greek as *lytron*, in Latin as *redemptio*, and in English as “redemption.” Thus, the primary meaning of the word “redemption,” as attributed to Christ’s work so many times in the New Testament, is of *deliverance* in a social sense from enemies and in a mostly personal sense from sin. The end of deliverance is light, peace, and holiness.

⁷² *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 456.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 457; and “The Redemption,” 17.

⁷⁴ “The Redemption,” 17-18, emphasis added.

2.1.2. *Redemption as an End*

After stating the thesis itself, Lonergan's first move in thesis 15 is to distinguish between redemption as mediation and redemption as an end:

Redemption as end is the state of the redeemed; the redeemed are those who, freed from past evils, enjoy the goods bestowed on them. *Redemption as mediation* regards the process headed towards the end — a 'medium' is that which is directed towards an end — and denotes the intervention of a person so that the end may be arrived at.⁷⁵

Lonergan states that redemption as an end "is commonly called 'salvation.'"⁷⁶ He cites Romans 8:24, "in hope we were saved," to indicate that salvation, or redemption as an end, is divided into two stages, one that has happened and one that is in hope, or one earthly and one heavenly. Humanity has been saved by Christ, and there are real, present benefits to Christ's work. Yet there remains a hope for the final, definitive salvation.

Already in this life we have been freed from "the power of darkness," "the fear of death," and "sin and punishment." We have been "reconciled with God and the justified," have received "the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and adoptive sonship," and are able to "approach God with confidence."⁷⁷ These are "true goods" already bestowed in this earthly stage. Furthermore, they include "forgiveness of sins, justification, the Holy Spirit poured into our hearts, charity, peace with God, our life hidden with Christ in God, and the like."⁷⁸

Redemption as a final, definitive end is the mysterious, dynamic state traditionally conceived as being with God in heaven. It is an "eternal redemption," a state of peace

⁷⁵ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 446.

⁷⁶ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 459.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 446.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 459. More shall be said on this in section 4.3.5. of this chapter, but to sufficiently discuss the issues of how we are saved now would require fully developed presentations on grace, ecclesiology, the sacraments and sacramentology, Pneumatology, etc. — all of which lie beyond the scope of this dissertation.

“when we shall no longer work out our salvation in fear and trembling.”⁷⁹ Then we shall receive “resurrection of the body, the crown of glory, and eternal life with Christ.”⁸⁰

2.1.3. *Redemption as a Mediation of Reconciliation*

Redemption is not simply an end, but also a process or movement. And for Lonergan, this process is not simply a means, but a mediation. Redemption has a “sense of a personal intervention,” for it concerns “the interpersonal relations between Christ and God the Father, between Christ and sinners, and between Christ and those who are justified.”⁸¹

Lonergan affirms that Christ as human is the one mediator between God and humanity. Christ mediates redemption in his incarnation,⁸² his whole life (all his words and deeds, his entire person),⁸³ his passion, and his resurrection. Christ’s mediation is primarily of a new and better covenant between God and human persons.⁸⁴ What an older, biblical language calls a new covenant, modern society might call reconciliation.⁸⁵ Christ’s personal mediation is a mediation of interpersonal reconciliation: “The theme of reconciliation embraces the whole personal aspect of sin as offense against God and also of redemption as mediation.”⁸⁶

⁷⁹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 459-60, with reference to Heb 9:12, and Phil 2:12.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 446.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² *Ibid.*, 447. Lonergan mentions but does not discuss a patristic formula common to the Eastern and Western churches: “God became man that men might become Gods.”

⁸³ There is a way in which a person as a whole or at a decisive moment can stand as a symbol for something else, perhaps something greater. This, Lonergan calls, “incarnate meaning.” See “Time and Meaning,” *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1958-1964*, 101-02 and *Method*, 73.

⁸⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 462, with references to Heb 8:6, 8-12; 9:15; 12:24. I say “primarily” because redemption improves relations among human persons as well as between God and human persons, the topic of this chapter’s final section.

⁸⁵ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 446, 451, 485. Cf. “The Redemption,” 6; which quotes 2 Cor. 5:18 and 19.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 485.

In other words, sin, or negative human choice and action, creates a rupture in the relationships among human persons, with creation as a whole, and with God. Lonergan understands Christ's person, words, and deeds, and gifts—culminating with his suffering, death, and resurrection—to be an intervention in these ruptured relationships, an intervention that seeks not to increase separation but to heal and to deepen interpersonal bonds. This is why the Christian tradition, and Lonergan standing squarely within it, uses the language of forgiveness, love, and reconciliation when discussing redemption. It is why a redeemed humanity is described as the children of God who approach their father in confidence.

This traditional language is fundamental to Lonergan's theory of how redemption works.⁸⁷ Redemption conceived as interpersonal reconciliation achieved by personal mediation provides the all-important context for understanding Lonergan's more complicated analogies of satisfaction and the Law of the Cross—the topics of theses 16 and 17 (to be discussed in chapters 3 and 4 of this part). For now, we turn to other, more directly scriptural analogies for understanding Christ's work of mediation as presented in thesis 15.

2.2. Paying a Price

In general, Lonergan's thought on redemption is an attempt to transcend or to move beyond an understanding of Christ's work based on the analogy of a commercial

⁸⁷ Lonergan's distinction between common sense and theory, description and explanation, narrative and science (in the larger sense of *Wissenschaft*, not simply "natural science") was presented in part 1, section 1.5.5.

exchange.⁸⁸ This transcendence is not a total repudiation or even a complete abandonment of a commercial understanding. Lonergan is wary of potential errors that can arise when pushing such a commercial analogy; however, he retains this scriptural language while placing it in the richer interpersonal context of satisfaction, as we shall see in chapter three of this part.

Commercial language is common to New Testament descriptions of redemption. Several passages use the Greek terms, “*timê* [price], *agorazein* [to buy], *exagorazein* [to buy up, buy from].”⁸⁹ Even the word *lytron* and its cognates, translated as *redemptio* in the Vulgate and “redemption” in English, have commercial meanings.⁹⁰ Lonergan cites Mk 10:45 and Mt 20:28 as stating that Christ came to serve and to be “a ransom” for many. Such New Testament language of ransom or price paid comes from the pagan marketplace, particularly the market for slaves and captives.⁹¹

Lonergan insists, however, that we should not impose literally a pagan interpretation on scripture. This commercial language is metaphorical. No money changes hands. The commercial metaphor still has meaning, but this meaning is “minimal.” It indicates simply that redemption comes “on condition... and this condition is ‘giving his life.’”⁹²

⁸⁸ This is because of the problems that arise from pushing the analogy too far, and because the commercial transaction does not do justice to the interpersonal nature of redemption. More to follow in this section and section 3.2.

⁸⁹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 465. Among the passages Lonergan cites or quotes are 1 Cor. 6:20, Gal. 3:13, 1 Pt. 2:1, Rv. 5:9.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 463-64.

⁹¹ See section 2.1.1. where *lytron* is translated simply as “redemption.” Cf. *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 466.

⁹² *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 466.

Why is this condition required? Immediately the temptation might be to leap to the thought that God the Father demands the Son's death in order to change His mind and forgive humanity's sins. This will be considered in the next chapter on satisfaction. But it is important to stress that God's love and forgiveness are not conditional. Christ's mediation to God is not to be understood as a requirement for changing God's mind.⁹³ Redemption is the divine initiative. Lonergan maintains consistently that "in the redemption God is making issue with wickedness and transforming sin and its effect into the forgiveness of sin and recovery."⁹⁴

If Christ's "giving of his life" is not the condition required for changing God's mind, then of what is it the condition? The simple answer is redemption. This is what Lonergan clearly states here. Yet this too is a minimal response. Why is redemption achieved because Christ gives his life? What does this do to redeem humanity? How does it work?

Perhaps there are no perfect answers within the framework of this commercial metaphor. Lonergan writes that one can push the commercial metaphor in two ways. The first is to take the "for" (or *anti* in Greek) in Christ's giving his life as ransom "for many" as meaning "in substitution for." The second is to ask "to whom the price was paid."⁹⁵ The first, substitution, Lonergan calls "true in a way,"⁹⁶ but he critiques

⁹³ Traditional Catholic theology has maintained that God does not change in general. We are not to imagine God, then, as a black orb, but to understand God to the best of our abilities, as love in full. A good book on the topic of God and change is Thomas G. Weinandy's *Does God Suffer?* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000). The basic argument is that God is pure act and this act is love. God cannot become more loving because God is completely, overflowingly loving.

⁹⁴ "The Redemption," 19. Cf. for example, *Ibid.*, 528 and 583, where Lonergan quotes 2 Cor. 5:19, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them."

⁹⁵ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 464, 466.

substitution in thesis 16. Here Lonergan probably means that substitution is true inasmuch as Christ suffered “on behalf of” humans as we shall see in the next section on Christ’s vicarious suffering. There is danger, however, in such talk. Lonergan acknowledges this danger, and he focuses on it in thesis 16 on satisfaction.⁹⁷

As for the second way of extending the metaphor, that is, asking to whom the price was paid, Lonergan finds that attributing this to the devil can be helpful in its denial that the Father demanded Christ’s suffering and death to appease himself. Metaphorically understood, attributing it to the devil is a way of affirming “that it was... the evildoer’s hatred of the light that led to the death of Christ.” As evildoers, Lonergan names “the chief priests and Pharisees,” “Judas and Pilate and Herod.”⁹⁸ Despite the dangers of thinking of Christ as paying something to God, there is some legitimacy to this thought. Lonergan writes that Christ’s passion is in a sense “paid” to God in the very broad sense of given freely. This is how Lonergan would understand sacrifice. Sacrifice is not something God demands. It is an offering to God, freely given. In redemption this offering is of Christ’s self, his life, his suffering, and his death.⁹⁹

2.3. Vicarious Suffering and Death

As we have seen at the start of this chapter, thesis 15 of Lonergan’s *The Incarnate Word* affirms that redemption is by “Christ the Mediator’s vicarious suffering and death for sinners and on account of sins.” Lonergan treats this as truth, as a doctrine of the

⁹⁶ Ibid., 466.

⁹⁷ This will be a focus of section three of this chapter. The distinction is between “vicarious suffering” or “vicarious satisfaction” and “vicarious satispassion” or “vicarious substitutionary penal atonement.” Punishment in the first is taken on willingly out of love and sorrow. In the second, punishment is imposed as retribution.

⁹⁸ “The Redemption,” 18. See also *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 466-67.

⁹⁹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 466-67. More on this topic will follow in section 2.4.

church, to be believed in faith, but it “is not a doctrine clearly, distinctly, precisely, and coherently understood and explained.”¹⁰⁰ For reasons that will be clearer in the third chapter of this part, this teaching is highly problematic due to a popular misunderstanding of the doctrine. Thesis 15 simply presents the doctrine, while theses 16 and 17 seek to explain it. However, Lonergan’s language in thesis 15 anticipates the solutions of the latter theses. Let us consider Christ’s vicarious suffering and death for sinners in two parts: “for sinners” and “on account of sins.”

Lonergan compiles multiple scriptural references attesting to the early church’s faith that Christ died *for sinners* or *for us*.¹⁰¹ These references indicate four things: (1) that Christ’s passion is an act intended to benefit sinners, (2) that “sinners” includes all of humanity, each and every individual across time and space inasmuch as one is to some degree a sinner, (3) that Christ’s passion is “in accordance with the mystery of the cross,”¹⁰² and (4) that Christ suffered and died vicariously.

The benefit intended in the first of these three is redemption as an end, the deliverance from sin and enemies for holiness and peace in eternal life with God. The second, that Christ acted to benefit or to redeem all humanity, is commonly if not universally affirmed by Christians.¹⁰³ In its support, Lonergan adduces several scriptural

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 448.

¹⁰¹ (Ibid, 467): “He died for all (2 Cor 5:15, Heb 2:9), for individuals (Rom 14:15, 1 Cor 8:11), for the ungodly (Rom 5:6), for us (Rom 5:8, 1 Thes 5:10), and for our sins (1 Cor 15:3, 1 Pt 3:18). He gave his life as a ransom for many (Mk 10:45, Mt 20:28) and for all (1 Tm 2:6). He gave himself for us (Ti 2:14) and for our sins (Gal 1:4). He gave himself up for us (Eph 5:2), for the church (Eph 5:25), and for me (Gal 2:20). He was handed over for us all (Rom 8:32) and for our trespasses (Rom 4:25).”

¹⁰² *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 447: “He acts for sinners, that is, to bestow a benefit on sinners whose sins are forgiven; yet he also suffers for sinners in accordance with the mystery of the cross.”

¹⁰³ Against this is the non-Catholic belief in “double predestination”: that God intends for some people to go to heaven and for others to go to hell.

passages¹⁰⁴ in addition to the many footnoted above. The third aspect, that Christ died in accordance with the mystery of the cross, is in itself mysterious. Lonergan does not explain here what he means by “the mystery of the cross.” However, the title of thesis 17 is “Understanding the Mystery,” and Lonergan often referred to the thesis as the “Law of the Cross.”¹⁰⁵ I believe that in this thesis Lonergan explains what he means when affirming that Christ suffered “for us” and “in accordance with the mystery of the cross.” This is the topic of this part’s fourth chapter, but let me state here that the mystery of the cross has to do with accepting the negative consequences of sin in order to transform them into a communication to sinners that works to redeem sinners.

The fourth aspect is that Christ acted or suffered *vicariously* for sinners. Early in thesis 15, Lonergan defines the term, “vicarious” as acting or suffering “on behalf of another, for another, instead of another.”¹⁰⁶ Christ’s vicarious suffering and death is an important aspect of redemption for Lonergan.¹⁰⁷ The fullness of Lonergan’s understanding of Christ’s effort as vicarious act is found in his analogy of vicarious satisfaction, presented in thesis 16 and examined in the third chapter of this part.

In thesis 15, there is one further interesting aspect of Lonergan’s use of the word “vicarious” or *vicarius* in Latin. While he affirms that Christ’s work was vicarious,

¹⁰⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 468: “‘Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world’ (Jn 1:29); ‘to make expiation (*hilaskesthai*) for the sins of the people’ (Heb 2:17); ‘he is the expiation (*hilasmos*) for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world’ (1 Jn 2:2).”

¹⁰⁵ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 552, translator’s note. Hefling refers us, “for example” to Lonergan’s 1966 essay, “The Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical Mindedness,” *A Second Collection*, 7.

¹⁰⁶ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 446. The Latin is “*vice alterius, pro alio, quodammodo loco alterius*.”

¹⁰⁷ For his first three Christology courses at the Gregorianum (offered every other year between 1953 and 1958), Lonergan relied on the manual by Charles Boyer. During this time, he substituted Boyer’s presentation of Christ offering his own satisfaction (*propria satisfactio*) with a discussion of Christ offering vicarious satisfaction (*satisfactio vicaria*) (Crowe, *Christ and History*, 65).

Lonergan seems to deny that it is one of “substitution” (*substitutio/nem*).¹⁰⁸ He does not, however, to my knowledge, clarify the difference between the terms substitutionary and vicarious. Lonergan uses vicarious consistently to modify Christ’s work, but he uses substitution to modify non-Christian and mistaken interpretations of Christ’s work.¹⁰⁹ In thesis 16, substitution is used in the context of punishment, where it seems to completely absolve humanity of any work. Vicarious seems to be about satisfaction as apology, and Christ’s vicarious satisfaction seems not to replace but to cooperate with the sinner’s own act of satisfaction.

At stake too is the intentionality behind the act of satisfaction, particularly the Father’s intentionality. By no means does the Father demand satisfaction in the sense of *some suffering* (Christ’s or the sinner’s) as a condition of forgiveness. Satisfaction is proportionate to divine justice, but it is neither a need nor a motive for the redemption.

Having considered Christ’s suffering and death as working “for sinners,” we now turn to it as taking place “on account of sins.” As Lonergan presents it, there are two parts to the doctrine that Christ died on account of sins. Christ “acts so that sins may be taken away, cancelled, blotted out; yet he suffers in that sins have been, are, and will be committed.”¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Lonergan mentions substitution twice in thesis 15, both times in the context of ransom or price paid. First he affirms that substitution is an appropriate translation of the “for” (*anti* in Greek) in Lk 11:11, which he translates: “‘What Father ... will *instead of* a fish give ... a serpent?’” [*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 464] The second time Lonergan mentions substitution it is to argue against applying substitution to Christ’s work of redemption because it is a pagan interpretation, not appropriately imposed on scripture [*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 466].

¹⁰⁹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 466.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 447.

Earlier we affirmed that Christ died for sinners *despite* their sins; however, it is also true that Christ suffers and dies for humanity *because* of its sins. This is not to say that Christ loves sins. On the contrary, to say that Christ acts “on account of sins” means that Christ acts to remove or to take away sins. Lonergan explains that this is what is meant by the New Testament use of “expiation” or “propitiation” (*hilaskesthai*, *hilasmos*, or *hilastêron* in Greek).¹¹¹

Lonergan does not explain fully how expiation or propitiation removes sin, but he clearly is against a common misunderstanding of expiation or propitiation as acting upon God. He states that this misunderstanding may be attributed to a pagan usage in which expiation “appeases” or “placates” a pagan god or gods in order to prevent or to end being harmed by the god(s). This usage is not consonant with the Bible, however. In both the Old and the New Testaments, the priest or the sacrifice makes expiation for sins by taking sins away or removing them. The important point is that, “the action is not on God but on sins.”¹¹² God is the one who initiates the mediation of redemption by expiation: “God ‘first loved us and sent his Son to be the expiation (*hilasmos*) for our sins’ (1 Jn 4:10).”¹¹³ Again, we have Lonergan’s recurrent admonition that Christ’s work does not earn God’s favor. Rather, God’s eternal love—given freely at all times in all conditions—is the ultimate, first cause of Christ’s work.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 468: “Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world’ (Jn 1:29); ‘to make expiation (*hilaskesthai*) for the sins of the people’ (Heb 2:17); ‘he is the expiation (*hilasmos*) for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world’ (1 Jn 2:2).”

¹¹² *Ibid.* Cf. “The Redemption,” 15-16. There, Lonergan considers expiation in the context of sacrifice.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 447. Cf. 486, where Lonergan states that Christ satisfied for the sins of all of humanity.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 468. In this section of the *The Incarnate Word*, Lonergan discusses the fact that Christ’s vicarious suffering and death are part of God’s plan. He points out that “further questions” can arise regarding the Father’s role in the Son’s passion and the reason why the savior came, not in “power and glory” but “in

This leads us to a second, more basic but crucial, aspect of Christ's suffering and dying "on account of sin." In addition to the fact that Christ suffers to do away with sin, sin is the proximate cause of Christ's passion. The sins of "Judas, the priests, the crowd, Pilate, the soldiers" and all of humanity led to Christ's affliction.¹¹⁵ Christ also suffers from "sins [that] have been, are, and will be committed."¹¹⁶

2.4. Sacrifice

In an early essay, Lonergan defines sacrifice in general as "a proper symbol of a sacrificial attitude."¹¹⁷ A symbol is an objective manifestation that is both sensible and social. As a sensible manifestation it displays thoughts or feelings in a way perceptible to the physical senses. As a social manifestation it communicates individual or shared thoughts and feelings, thus sacrifice manifests socially and perceptibly sacrificial thoughts and feelings. Sacrificial feelings and thoughts are never owed to people but "to God alone as Creator, First Agent, Supreme Good, and Ultimate End."¹¹⁸ Lonergan analyzes sacrificial thoughts and feelings in four categories: (1) "latreutic" or worshipful, (2) "propitiatory" or repentant of one's sins, (3) "eucharistic" or thankful for past benefits received, and (4) "impetratory" or in petition for benefits to be received.¹¹⁹

suffering flesh." We reserve these questions and their answers until the fourth major section of this chapter, which covers Lonergan's thesis 17.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 469. Cf. 452.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 447. This is due to his divine knowledge and love.

¹¹⁷ Bernard Lonergan, "The Notion of Sacrifice," trans. Michael Shields, *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 19 (2001): 3. This article is based on a set of materials probably used for teaching a course on the Eucharist at the Collège de l'Immaculée-Conception in Montreal in 1943-44 and/or a seminar on the Eucharist there the following year, and/or a series of lectures on the Eucharist at the Thomas Moore Institute in the same year ("Translator's Introduction," 1)

¹¹⁸ Ibid. In particular, it is the worship aspect of sacrifice that makes it proper to give sacrifice to God alone.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

In “The Redemption,” Lonergan writes that for Catholics there can be “no doubt whatever” that Christ’s work is a sacrifice. However, he treats sacrifice with some concern, noting both the difficulty in trying to understand “the precise sense in which there is a sacrifice” and that “clearly the notion of sacrifice is not an intelligibility that exhausts the meaning of the redemption.”¹²⁰

As is his habit, Lonergan’s approach to sacrifice is faith seeking understanding. He first establishes scriptural passages that explicitly or implicitly call Christ’s passion a sacrifice. Explicitly we have, for example, “‘Christ our Pasch has been sacrificed’ (1 Cor. 5:7). Again, ‘Christ offered himself up as a sacrifice of sweet odor’ (Eph. 5:2).” Implicitly we have “in 1 Corinthians, chapter 11, on the institution of the Eucharist: ‘This is my body which is given for you; this is my blood which is to be shed for you for the remission of sin.’”¹²¹

In “The Redemption,” Lonergan discusses how the Greek *hilakesthai* can be translated as “sacrifice.” In *The Incarnate Word*, as seen in the previous section, Lonergan preferred the words “expiation” and “propitiation” when translating *hilakesthai*. Whether translated as sacrifice or expiation/propitiation, Lonergan distinguishes between two possible, divergent contexts for understanding *hilakesthai*: in the Septuagint as “something that removes sin” or in classical Greek, where it “means to

¹²⁰ “The Redemption,” 15-16.

¹²¹ Ibid., 15, referring to 1 Cor. 11:25. Lonergan does not seem to have written much on the Eucharist in the context of redemption. He mentions its institution in scripture and cites Mt 26:28, Mk 14:24, Lk. 22:20, and 1 Cor. 11:25 [*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 474]. He defers to Thomas’s treatment of it in the context of sacrifice in *Summa Theologica* III, q. 48, a.3 [*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 485].

placate the gods, to avert their anger or vengeance.”¹²² As in his examination of vicarious suffering, but even more strongly here, Lonergan argues that *hilakesthai* in the New Testament is to be understood according to the Septuagint/Hebrew context, and consequently as operating on sin, rather than on “the feelings of a god.”¹²³ Lonergan does not explain how sacrifice operates on sin. Theses 16 and 17 may shed light on this, however. In both theses, sin and its consequences do not become the causes of further sin and suffering. Instead, they are transformed into goods, as we shall see.

Finally, in this essay, Lonergan notes the connection of Christ’s death and resurrection to the liturgy, prayer, and piety. This connection is helpful for understanding Christ’s work; however, Christ’s work is “not simply a ritual act, but his own suffering and death and glorious resurrection.”¹²⁴

In thesis 15 of *The Incarnate Word*, Lonergan examines carefully the Letter to the Hebrews, where “above all it is... that the death of Christ is presented as a sacrifice.”¹²⁵ First Lonergan analyzes sacrifice in general according to six components: (1) the *effect* which is the remission of sins, sanctification, and the ability to approach God in confidence; (2) the *recipients*: people on whose behalf sacrifice is made; (3) the *agent*, designated as “priest;” (4) the *sufferer*, or the passive sacrificial victim or offering; (5) the *action*, or the offering of a victim by a priest; (6) the *foundation*, a covenant or testament

¹²² “The Redemption,” 15. Lonergan credits the then Cambridge professor C. H. Dodd, “*Hilakesthai*, its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms, in the Septuagint,” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1930-31): 352-60. See also *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 468

¹²³ “The Redemption,” 16.

¹²⁴ Ibid. Curiously, Lonergan does not mention the Eucharist in this section or the entire essay.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 15.

by which a priest is selected from the people to act on their behalf.¹²⁶ This analysis is based loosely on Heb 5:1-2.

Lonergan then applies this general analysis to four sets of old and new—an old and a new covenant, mediator, priesthood, and sacrifice. Both *covenants* were entered into by sacrifice, but while the old covenant was entered into by the blood of an animal, the second was by the blood of Christ.¹²⁷ According to the book of Jeremiah, the new covenant would enable all people to know God and God’s law inwardly. Furthermore, by this new covenant God and all people would belong to each other, and God would remember the sins of humanity no more.¹²⁸ In comparing the *mediators* of the covenants, Moses was faithful with the faith of a servant of God, while Christ is faithful with the faith of the Son of God (who nonetheless was “like us in all respects apart from sin”).¹²⁹

Third, Hebrews compares the *priesthoods* of the mediators of the covenants. The old Levitical priesthood contained many priests who were mortal, took no oaths, and sacrificed for their own sins in a sanctuary made by human hands. Christ, on the other hand, is a unique and everlastingly priest, who inhabits a priesthood constituted by divine oath, and who remains perfectly unstained in his heavenly exaltation.¹³⁰ Fourth, the *sacrifices* made by the priests who mediate the covenants are compared. The older sacrifices, made under the law were shadows of Christ’s sacrifice. They were temporary and cleansed only the flesh, not the consciences of sinners. Furthermore, they could not take away sins. The sacrifice of Christ is permanent, cleanses consciences, and removes

¹²⁶ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 471.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 471-72. Lonergan refers to Ex 24:8, Heb 9:19-21

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 472, quoting Heb 8:8-12; Jer 31:31-34.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, citing Heb 1:2-3, 2:14-17, 3:2-6.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 472-73; citing or quoting Heb 5:3-6; 7:16-17, 20-21, 23-24, and 26-28; and 9:6-7 and 24-26.

people's transgressions.¹³¹ Furthermore, Christ's sacrifice is "once for all" "offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins."¹³² Thus our sins are remembered no more. Finally, Christ's sacrifice is unique because in it Christ is both the priest who actively offers sacrifice and the offering passively being made. Christ's sacrifice is a free self-offering, not an appeasement.¹³³

2.5. Meritorious Obedience

Scripture and tradition affirm that Christ mediated redemption through his free, meritorious obedience to his father's commands—an obedience even unto death.¹³⁴ How is this obedience to be understood? What does it do if it is not an appeasement? Does the Father force the Son to die? Is there a good reason for the Father's command or is it capricious? Is Christ's meritorious obedience to be understood like the tricks a dog performs for a biscuit?

These are questions that Lonergan does not settle in this section, though he gives us some clues. The first is his broadening of command and obedience to include all of Christ's works, not simply his suffering and death. Indeed, Christ's very existence as incarnate is a command in the sense of an act proceeding from the Father. God the Father sent the Son on a mission to save the human race.¹³⁵ This mission is achieved in both the person of the Son and in his human acts. Insofar as the mission regards Christ's person, it

¹³¹ Ibid., 473-74; citing or quoting Heb 9:9-10, 13-15, 28; 10:1-2, 4-7, 10, 14, and 17-18. What it means to take away sins or to remove transgressions, I am not sure. It cannot mean that God pretends they never happened, for this would make God dishonest. My guess is that it heals the world of the negative consequences of sin. More specifically, it promotes reconciliation among persons estranged by sin.

¹³² Ibid., 473-74; quoting, respectively, Heb 10:10 and 10:12.

¹³³ See Ibid., 466-67.

¹³⁴ Ibid. 478. Lonergan adduces: Jn 10:17; Mt 26:39-44, 53-54; Rom 5:19; Phil 2:8-9; DB 790, 799, 820, 842, 843; DS 1513, 1529, 1560, 1582, 1583; and Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III, q. 48, a. 1.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 475, citing Gal 4:4-5 and Rom 8:3-4. The "even unto death" comes from Phil 2:8-9.

flows from the Son's eternal procession from the Father and "an appropriate external term."¹³⁶ To the extent that the mission regards Christ's human acts, it flows from a relationship with the Father that scripture refers to with the words "command" and "obedience."¹³⁷

Following Thomas, Lonergan defines obedience as being "moved by another through reason and will," and, conversely, "to command is to move another through reason and will."¹³⁸ This definition is of fundamental importance for understanding the relationship of the Father and the Son in the Son's mission of redemption.

On hearing that Christ suffered and died out of obedience, a contemporary Western reader (formed by individualism, human rights, and other ideas of the Enlightenment and modern liberalism) might to come to believe that the Father forced or coerced the Son to act against the Son's will in a manner that violated the Son's freedom. On the contrary, Christ's suffering and death (as well as his life and resurrection) were acts of both perfect obedience and perfect freedom. Freedom and obedience can coexist in one act. "That this obedience on Christ's part was free is proved by the explicit statement of Christ (Jn 10:17), by his repeated prayer and submission (Mt 26:39-44), and by the possibility of his avoiding his suffering (Mt 26:53-54)."¹³⁹

¹³⁶ Ibid. Here Lonergan refers the reader to his works *Divinarum Personarum*, pp. 206ff, or *De Deo Trino*, II, pp. 226ff [chapter 6, assertion 17]. An English version of the latter has been published as *The Triune God*, trans. Michael Shields (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007). See also *Insight*, 661-62.

¹³⁷ "Christ's obedience in accepting his suffering and death is mentioned both in the gospels (Mk 14:36 and parallels) and by Paul (Phil 2:8, Rom 5:19)" (Ibid., 476). "Christ testified that he had commands from his Father: a command regarding what to say and what to speak (Jn 12:49), a command to lay down his life and to take it up again (Jn 10:17-18), and others besides (Jn 15:10)" [*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 475].

¹³⁸ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), citing Thomas's *Summa Theologica* II-II, q. 104, a. 1 and III, q. 47, a. 2 *ad* 1m; a. 3 c.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 479.

How can this be? How can Christ be both obedient and free? The possibility relies on the fact that command and obedience work through the intelligences and wills of the persons commanding and obeying. The Father does not force or coerce the Son against what he knows and chooses. The Father works with and through Christ's knowledge and choice. How? Persuasion? No, something more intimate. The key is the perfect intimacy, the perfect unity, shared by the Father and the Son. The key to this unity is the love they share. Christ is and was free to do as he pleased. Christ could have chosen a comfortable life of obscurity, but because he loved the Father, what he was pleased to do was what the Father willed for him to do, i.e. to fulfill the Father's plan for human salvation. Thus, Christ's "food was to do the will of him who sent him and to accomplish his work (Jn 4:34)."¹⁴⁰

Consequently, when Lonergan mentions obedience, he often pairs it with love.¹⁴¹ He may go so far as to identify obedience with love: "Thomas says it best when he relates the love and the obedience of Christ in a way that in some sense reduces them to one: 'He [Christ] fulfilled the commandments of charity out of obedience, and was obedient out of his love for the Father who had given him the command.'"¹⁴² Obedience in this sense is a unity of heart and mind, a free choice and personal desire to do what one's beloved knows is good and desires to be done.

Christ's suffering and death alone are not redemptive; it is his suffering and death *out of love and obedience* that merits redemption, provides satisfaction, and is the

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 475.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 455, 532, 537, 541, 543-44, and 556.

¹⁴² Ibid., 479, citing *Summa Theologica* III, q. 47, a. 2 *ad* 3m.

principle of the Law of the Cross. Satisfaction and the Law of the Cross are the topics of futures chapters, but let us turn briefly to the meritorious aspect of obedience. Lonergan accepts as a matter of “defined faith” that Christ’s obedience is meritorious of our salvation.¹⁴³ He sums up this teaching:

For merit is a deed worthy of reward. But Paul gives Christ’s obedience “unto death, even death on a cross,” as the basis of the exaltation that followed (Phil 2:8-9). The letter to Hebrews states that he is “crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death” (Heb 2:9). The letter to the Romans teaches that “by one man’s obedience many will be made righteous” (Rom 5:19). Hence Thomas (*ST*, III, q. 48, a. 1) and all theologians teach that Christ caused our salvation by way of merit.¹⁴⁴

Anticipating the possible objection that all of Christ’s activity is meritorious, not simply his acts of obedience, Lonergan affirms that all of Christ’s acts are acts of obedience and love, beginning with his coming as human, continuing in his all his teachings, and finding fulfillment in his suffering and his death.¹⁴⁵

Despite the fact that Christ’s love and obedience pervaded his whole life, scripture affirms that Christ “learned obedience” and was “made perfect” by his suffering (Heb 2:10, 5:8). Lonergan’s interpretation of these passages is ingenious and perhaps original. He writes that Christ’s passion is an act not only of the intellect and will, but of the whole person, including the body. The body has its own desires.¹⁴⁶ Consequently, it is one thing to know and to will an act and another to do it. Christ had perfect unity of heart and mind with God, and at the same time he was like us in every respect but sin.

He lived in the flesh and was tempted as we are. In carrying out his free decision to obey

¹⁴³ Ibid., 478., citing DB 790, 799, 820, 842, 843; DS 1513, 1529, 1560, 1582, 1583.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 478-79. In addition, Lonergan notes here that merit is fitting, because “it is appropriate for an operation carried out at someone else’s command to be rewarded in a special way by the one who commanded it.”

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 479 and 475-6. One might also say that all of Christ’s acts are the Father’s acts, due to their unity of love.

¹⁴⁶ This was discussed under “sensitive spontaneity” in Ch. 1, section 1.3.3.

the Father, Christ overcame his temptation and “his being distressed, troubled, and sorrowful even unto death (Mk 14:33-34).”¹⁴⁷ In doing so, he did not grow in his infused virtue, but exercised these virtues to perfection. Thus, by conforming his whole being, body and soul, to his love, Christ “learned obedience” and by exercising his virtuous, loving obedience even unto death, Christ was “made perfect.”

Furthermore, in a 1963 address at the Thomas Moore Institute in Montreal, Lonergan argued that Christ was made perfect not for himself, but for us. As a divine person, it would have been more suitable for him to have been born rich and to be honored, but Christ chose

the perfection of a person who lives a life of poverty and suffering, who dies in abandonment, unjustly and cruelly. Christ chose and decided to perfect himself in the manner in which he did *because of us*. We think of the way of the cross primarily as the cross of Christ. But primarily the way of the cross is the way in which fallen nature acquires its perfection. We attain resurrection through death because death is the wages of sin, and death entered into the world through sin.¹⁴⁸

More on this will be said in chapter four on the “Law of the Cross,” but let us say now that Christ chose to perfect himself through suffering, through lovingly accepting the consequences because he knew that this was the way that sinful humanity would be able to stop individual and social spirals of sin and violence. Christ chose this way to mediate or to communicate this fact to us incarnately, by deeds and example.

2.6. The Risen Lord and Eternal Priest

Christ’s work of mediating redemption to the world does not end with his death on the cross. It continues in his resurrection and in his life eternal. Lonergan goes so far

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 477.

¹⁴⁸ “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1958-1964*, 180-81, emphasis added.

as to say that to abstract Christ's resurrection from redemption would be similar to abstracting "foot" from "animal."¹⁴⁹ The one can only be understood in relation to the other. Christ could not have risen without first dying, and Christ's death is for the purpose of the resurrection. Lonergan cites Jn 10:27-18 on the fact that Christ "laid down his life *so that* he could take it up again."¹⁵⁰ To speak of Christ's death is always to speak "about that concrete death which the Lord intended and chose and suffered—a death leading to resurrection so that death might be conquered and destroyed by death."¹⁵¹

More specifically, when interpreting the cross through all of the above ways of thinking—of redemption for us on account of sin, as paying a price, as vicarious, as sacrifice, and as meritorious obedience—one must consider this death not simply as any death but as the death of one who will be raised. Conversely, when considering the risen Christ, we cannot forget his death. However, there are certain aspects of redemption that are more easily observed in the crucified Christ and others more salient in Christ as risen. For example, Lonergan writes, it is easier to attend to Christ's passive role when meditating on his crucifixion, while his active role in redemption is more apparent after he has risen. What exactly is this risen role?

Lonergan presents four aspects of this role. The first is *sanctification*. Lonergan summarizes that Christ "was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification" (Rom 4:25); because of this justification, 'your life is hid with Christ in

¹⁴⁹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 480.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

God' (Col 3:3); and without this resurrection and justification we should still be in our sins, for 'if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins' (1 Cor 15:17)."¹⁵²

The second is as *eternal Priest*. This is distinct from Christ's role as High Priest who offers himself as sacrifice for our sins. As eternal Priest, Christ "has obtained a more excellent ministry (Heb 8:6), and is 'seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, a minister in the sanctuary and the true tabernacle which is set up not by man but by the Lord' (Heb 8:1-2). There he appears in the presence of God for us (Heb 9:24)."¹⁵³ The term "eternal Priest" is an analogical way of discussing the interpersonal nature of how "we are drawn towards love for God the Father through his incarnate Son in the Holy Spirit."¹⁵⁴

The third aspect of the risen Christ's role, *intercession*, is initiated just before Christ's death in his prayer to his Father. Announcing that he will soon be leaving the world, Christ prays in petition that humanity may be sanctified in truth, protected from the evil one, but above all, that its members may be one with each other and one with the Father and Christ. This is a unity in love and glory, sharing in the unity that the Father and Son have enjoyed since before the foundation of the world.¹⁵⁵

The fourth aspect of Christ's role as risen Lord and eternal Priest, is his *sending of the Holy Spirit*. Christ "breathed on the apostles so that they might receive the Spirit and

¹⁵² Ibid., 482.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 483. Lonergan refers us to *Divinarum Personarum*, pp. 229-239, or *De Deo Trino*, II, pp. 249-259 [Chapter 6, Question 32 and Assertion 18].

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., with reference to Jn., Ch 17. See also section 4.3.5.2., below.

have power to forgive sins (Jn 20:22-23).”¹⁵⁶ By this Spirit we are made into children of God, able to call on God as Father (Gal. 4:5, Rom 8:15), and it was only after Christ had departed to his glory that we received the Spirit (Jn 7:39, 16:7).¹⁵⁷

This concludes our exposition of Lonergan’s thesis 15. Lonergan wrote that this thesis treated “the teaching of the New Testament.”¹⁵⁸ Our contention is the teaching of the New Testament is a teaching through likeness in the manner of analogy. Its basic analogies reveal aspects of the mystery of redemption. On these basic analogies, or metaphors, Lonergan builds with the more complicated and controlled analogies of satisfaction and the Law of the Cross—the topics of Lonergan’s theses 16 and 17 and of the next two chapters.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 484.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 445.

Chapter 3. Christ's Work as Satisfaction: A Communication Primarily to God

Although he is very aware of the serious difficulties surrounding the notion of satisfaction, Lonergan believes that it is an issue that must be faced. Toward the beginning of thesis 16 of *The Incarnate Word*, he presents briefly the history of official church teaching on the matter. The teaching is clear but minimal. The Council of Trent affirms that by Christ's "most holy Passion on the wood of the cross" he "merited satisfaction for us" and "made satisfaction for us to God the Father."¹⁵⁹ From Leo XIII, Lonergan adds that satisfaction is *by* Christ's blood and *of* the Father's violated majesty.¹⁶⁰ From Vatican I we have the addition that divine justice is what Christ satisfied.¹⁶¹ Furthermore, human persons are not simply passive, vicarious recipients of satisfaction. We are to satisfy for our sins and thus to be made like Christ.¹⁶²

Due to these teachings, Lonergan takes satisfaction as a given yet to be understood. But what exactly does it *mean* to say that by his blood and passion Christ satisfied divine justice and the Father's majesty?¹⁶³ Satisfaction is an analogy. It is a way of understanding the mystery of redemption by likeness. And as Lonergan understands it, it is a helpful, overarching way of grasping and relating the scriptural analogies presented above: redemption, price paid, sacrifice, meritorious obedience, and

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 487, quoting from DB 904; DS 1690.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., quoting from *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 33 (1900-1901): 275

¹⁶¹ Ibid., citing *Collectio Lacensis Conciliorum Recentiorum*, VII, 561a, 566c.

¹⁶² Ibid., quoting from the council of Trent, DB 904; DS 1690.

¹⁶³ Lonergan notes that satisfaction is presumed but not defined by the council of Trent [*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 488].

passion for us and for our sins.¹⁶⁴

Satisfaction is not only a higher intelligibility or a more encompassing analogy, it is an intelligibility of fittingness. As we saw earlier,¹⁶⁵ redemption is a mystery in the Persian/Hebrew sense of God's "wise plan." According to Lonergan, satisfaction is not absolutely or hypothetically necessary, but it is supremely fitting, appropriate, or prudent. Thus, one way of phrasing the question for this chapter is: How is Christ's satisfaction wise and fitting?

The search for understanding of Christ's satisfaction is not purely academic. If we are to follow Christ and to be made like him in satisfaction, it is important that we know what satisfaction is and how it is fitting. There are consequences to our understanding.

Satisfaction is a difficult and controversial term. In this chapter we seek to shed some light on the issue, first by distinguishing between Anselm's thought on satisfaction and a later perversion of Anselm's thought called "satispassion." Once these have been clarified and contrasted, we can turn to Lonergan's helpful theory of satisfaction as an analogy for understanding the redemption and, in particular, the role of Christ's crucifixion.

3.1. The Context: Satisfaction vs. Satispassion

3.1.1. Satispassion, a Misunderstanding

The cross is popularly understood to be a punishment that Christ bore in the place of humanity, a kind of payment to God or the devil for our sins. In gratitude and

¹⁶⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 488, 491, 537-39.

¹⁶⁵ See sections 1.1. and 1.2.1. of this chapter.

sympathy, we bear our small crosses just as Christ bore the sins of all humanity. But there are problems with this image. It has been criticized, particularly by feminist and liberation theologians, for portraying God as a petty, even sadistic, tyrant. If it is God who receives Christ's punishment as payment, then divine love and forgiveness seem conditional. If it is the devil, then God seems not to be omnipotent.¹⁶⁶ This has implications for human relations. Those in power, thinking they are imitating God the Father, impose suffering cruelly. Conversely, people who are unjustly oppressed may believe they are imitating the Son of God by tolerating and sometimes even seeking suffering.

Rita Nakashima Brock, a mixed-race, American Protestant feminist theologian, has documented well this problem. Years of work as a counselor to women and children who have been victims of "racism, sexism, rape, homophobia, gang violence, poverty, drugs, child abuse, and incest," have given Brock first-hand experience of injustice linked to a poor understanding of the cross.¹⁶⁷ She writes:

[The] loving father sends his son to be killed and the innocent, obedient son went without complaint. This union of love and violence is the false trap for women and children created by battering relationships in which, for centuries, the church preached acquiescence to abuse and forgiveness of perpetrators without accountability.... Jesus, depicted as an innocent lamb taken to slaughter for us, reinforces the idea that abuse is all right for a good reason. Structures of oppression and violence become acceptable, if they serve a good purpose. If divine child abuse, to save humanity is acceptable, and human parents are to obey the example set by the Father, then violence against children and women can be justified on the same grounds as has been the case in the Christian tradition.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ *DVI*, (trans., Hefling), 498.

¹⁶⁷ Rita Nakashima Brock, "Losing Your Innocence But Not Your Hope," *Reconstructing the Christ Symbol*, ed. by Maryanne Stevens (NY: Paulist Press, 1993), 35.

¹⁶⁸ Rita Nakashima Brock, "The Greening of the Soul: A Feminist Theological Paradigm of the Web of Life," *Setting the Table, Women in Theological Conversation*, ed. Rita Nakashima Brock, et. al. (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 1996), 146-47.

Injustices rationalized by a misguided imitation of the Father's role in redemption and of the Son's role are called, respectively, "Christian sadism" and "Christian masochism" by the German Protestant liberation theologian, Dorothea Sölle. Suffering understood in a sado-masochistic context views all suffering as good, as "there to break our pride," "to be a test, sent by God, that we are required to pass," "a punishment that follows earlier sins" and/or "a refining from which we come out purified."¹⁶⁹ Either to avoid punishment in hell or to grow in holiness, Christians sometimes not only bear unnecessary suffering but *seek* it out. "Submission as a source of pleasure—that is Christian masochism."¹⁷⁰

As bad as this is, worse still is Christian, or "theological," sadism. It holds that God, as all-powerful, is the cause of all suffering, and God, as just, gives only the amount of suffering that is deserved. It sums up atonement in the sentence "the first person of the Trinity casts out and annihilates the second."¹⁷¹ A Christian imitation of God the Father that is based on this misunderstanding of the Father's relationship to human suffering results in human sadism according to Sölle. "The ultimate conclusion of theological sadism is worshiping the executioner."¹⁷²

The atonement theory at the basis of Sölle's criticism of "Christian sadism" and "Christian masochism" and of Brock's criticism of "divine child abuse" is commonly called "substitutionary penal atonement" or "vicarious penal atonement." The theory reduces Christ's work to a simple exchange, the payment of a debt, intended to appease

¹⁶⁹ Dorothea Sölle, *Suffering*, trans. Everett Kalin (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1975), 19.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 22.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 28.

the Father's wrath. According to this way of thinking, human sin is disobeying God and a blow to divine honor. It creates a debt that someone must pay. God responds to sin primarily, if not exclusively, with wrath, and he demands human punishment to appease this wrath. The punishment is death. Only this can make God happy. For some inscrutable or arbitrary reason, the Father commands that the Son take our place and be punished in our stead. The Son obeys. He atones for our sins by taking our punishment.

The central problem with substitutionary penal atonement is its emphasis on punishment.¹⁷³ It insists that Christ was punished to a degree sufficient to earn God's forgiving love. This theory Lonergan calls "satispassion," thus highlighting helpfully the difference between it and satisfaction.¹⁷⁴ The fullness of Lonergan's distinction between the two is given in his definition of divine justice and its relation to punishment (to follow in section 3.2.1).

3.1.2. *Anselm's Satisfaction*

Despite the real distinction between satisfaction and substitutionary penal atonement, they are often confused. Anselm of Canterbury is typically credited with or blamed for the theory of satisfaction, particularly because of his work *Cur Deus Homo*? However, Lonergan,¹⁷⁵ Lonergan scholars,¹⁷⁶ and other theologians,¹⁷⁷ believe that

¹⁷³ As we shall see in section four, Lonergan follows Thomas in integrating satisfaction with punishment, however, this depends on a particular definition of punishment as well as the stipulation that punishment plays a role subordinate to the "moral compensation" of apologizing for an offense.

¹⁷⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 494. The translator's note states that *satis-factio* is "doing enough" while *satis-passio* is "having enough done to one." See also Roy, 525.

¹⁷⁵ Lonergan, "The Redemption," 8, 13, 19-20.

¹⁷⁶ For example: Hefling, "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement," 55, 60; Louis Roy, "The Death of Jesus: Its Universal Impact," *New Blackfriars* 83 (2002): 521, 525.

¹⁷⁷ For example: D. Bentley Hart, "A Gift Exceeding Every Debt: An Eastern Orthodox Appreciation of Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*," *Pro Ecclesia* VII, 3: 333-39.

Anselm himself, while not free of difficulties, is not directly to blame for the idea of substitutionary penal atonement.

Anselm does introduce a conception of atonement in which satisfaction plays the central role, although for Anselm satisfaction is the payment not of a debt of suffering but of a debt of obedience. Obedience, for Anselm as well as for Lonergan, does not necessarily involve punishment. In fact, Anselm holds strictly that satisfaction is the *alternative* to punishment.¹⁷⁸

Here is his theory in brief: All that humanity has, it has been given by God. Humans owe God everything, particularly their lives lived in obedience. Sin withholds this from God, creating an infinite debt, due to the infinite dignity of God. This is a debt that humanity as sinful should pay but as finite and, already owing all it has to God, cannot. God as infinite could pay but as innocent of sin should not. What is needed is a savior who combines human obligation with divine ability, the human “should” with the divine “could.” The savior must be a “God-Man.” Christ as divine and thus infinite can pay, and as human, he should. This Christ does. He freely offers his life, which is of infinite worth, to God. Christ does not suffer in punishment. He offers God a satisfactory gift, his unowed life—unowed because he did not sin. Christ’s gift satisfies humanity’s debt.¹⁷⁹ Christ “does enough” rather than “suffers enough.” Thus, Anselm’s theory may be called one of satisfaction, while vicarious penal atonement is better called *satispassion*.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo?* Bk. I, Chs. xii-xix, Bk. II Ch. xvii-xviii.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., Bk. I, Ch. viii; Bk. 2, Ch. xi.

¹⁸⁰ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 498.

The difference between satisfaction and satispassion is the central difference between Anselm's theory and substitutionary penal atonement theory. But there are other differences: Anselm's theory is not penal since in his theory God does not punish at all let alone to a degree that satisfies divine wrath. God is satisfied by Christ's free and obedient offering of his life. Satisfaction is set up as an alternative to punishment. For Anselm satisfaction is only partially substitutionary, in that Christ provides the satisfaction that humanity owes, but human persons are to take part in the redemption by personal contrition, confession of sins, and forgiving others. His thought certainly regards atonement, and it is probably the first beginnings of a theory of atonement, for it aims not merely to proclaim the effects of atonement, but to explain how it works.

While not all charges leveled against Anselm are true, the analogy of exchange remains problematic. Satisfaction is necessary to pay a debt to God's honor. This necessity makes God's love seem subordinate to, if not eclipsed by, God's justice. Its emphasis on a debt to God's honor makes God seem petty. Its demand for a satisfaction of this debt makes salvation appear to require a change in God, as if God's forgiveness were contingent.¹⁸¹ The stress on God's honor obscures the historical and human factors that put Jesus to death: the misunderstanding, fear, and envy of religious and secular authorities, as well as the complicity of "the crowd." Anselm's focus on the "necessity" of a God-Man makes God seem constrained to redeem humanity, and it makes humanity seem almost one-sidedly passive in the work of redemption. Finally, Anselm's strict

¹⁸¹ Though to be fair, Anselm does maintain that God is not dishonored in himself, but rather that he "appears" to be dishonored in relation to us. Sin and satisfaction do not produce a change in God (See Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo?* Bk. I, Ch. xi).

choice of *either* punishment *or* satisfaction goes against scripture and tradition, which affirms that Christ in some ways was punished in that through death he paid the penalty of sin.

Lonergan's treatment of satisfaction attempts to resolve such issues as God's justice seeming greater than God's love, God's love seeming contingent, salvation through suffering seeming necessary, and humanity's role appearing merely passive. It attempts to do so in a satisfying, systematic way while remaining faithful to traditional Christian doctrine.¹⁸²

3.2. Lonergan's Satisfaction: A Communication of Detestation and Sorrow

Despite its problems, Lonergan retains the notion of satisfaction, both because it accounts for such scriptural assertions as Christ died "on account of sins,"¹⁸³ and because it is a way to preserve what Christ did for us as God. One alternative to satisfaction is the "exemplarist" view, by which Christ's death becomes simply another martyrdom, a tragic loss of life for some cause, a loss that inspires others to improve their behavior.¹⁸⁴ By the exemplarist model, Christ need not have been divine; his death, while tragic and inspiring, would not differ in any meaningful way from, for example, the death of

¹⁸² There are many possible mistakes in addition to Anslem's flat denial of punishment. Brock and Sölle make excellent contributions in their critiques of vicarious penal atonement by exposing the social nature of sin and recovering a need for human agency, but they do not offer constructive, systematic replacements. And unfortunately, their deconstruction of mistaken elements in the tradition is accompanied by denial of some rather fundamental doctrines. Brock finds Christ's death a tragedy without salvific value, "Jesus did not die to save us. He died because the political, patriarchal powers of his day saw the danger of his life and his movement to their system of oppression. We are saved by the resurrection community.... This resurrection community is ourselves. We are called to be the wise and willful saving remnant that refuses to give up even when we are afraid. No one else can stop the suffering in our world but our own courage and willingness to act in the midst of the awareness of our own fragility. No one else can die for us" (*Losing*, 50). Sölle holds simply that the presence of suffering in the world indicates that God is not omnipotent (*Suffering*, 25).

¹⁸³ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 550.

¹⁸⁴ Hefling, "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement," 54-55.

Socrates.¹⁸⁵ Such an exemplarist view would disregard numerous New Testament images of ransom, sacrifice, payment of a price, and expiation.¹⁸⁶

While acknowledging its problems, Lonergan makes the best of satisfaction in thesis 16 of *The Incarnate Word*, “Christ’s Satisfaction.” His effort involves an oftentimes bewildering array of distinctions and relations. I believe two are of the greatest significance. They can be considered as organizing principles for his overall reflection on satisfaction. Thus, we organize this presentation of Lonergan on satisfaction in two parts: (1) the relation of satisfaction to divine justice and to different types of punishment, and (2) a contextualization of punishment, divine justice, and satisfaction within the interpersonal relationship called friendship.¹⁸⁷

Lonergan approaches Christ’s satisfaction by first building general tools in “Preliminary notes,” and then applying them to Christ’s work in the final one fifth of the thesis. We follow this procedure here.

3.2.1. *Satisfaction and Divine Justice*

After presenting Anselm’s notion of satisfaction and rescuing it from the common misinterpretation as substitutionary penal atonement, Lonergan focuses on a further

¹⁸⁵ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 452. This is not to say that Jesus is not an example. His work is not simply to be an example, but this is an important aspect of his work and his relation to us. We shall examine Lonergan’s views on this in section 4.3.3. I believe that one analogy for understanding the importance of example is through athletics. Occasionally an athlete will break an old record that seemed unbreakable. Often when this occurs many successive athletes will break this record. It seems that the original record-breaker not only provides an image to emulate, but a freeing of the imagination, an expansion of horizon that promotes self-transcendence. In this sense an example has a real effect that is subjective, but also objective. It is empowering.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Hefling, 54-55.

¹⁸⁷ In both moves, Lonergan follows Thomas Aquinas to a great degree. To what degree is important, but it is not our focus here. Our purpose is to gain some understanding of redemption by gaining some understanding of Lonergan’s understanding. For more on Lonergan’s original contribution, see Hefling’s “A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement” referenced above.

problem with Anselm's satisfaction—the problem of integrating Anselm's satisfaction with “the whole of tradition” which taught that Christ was punished or paid a penalty.¹⁸⁸ Whereas Anselm had attempted to maintain divine justice by his strict disjunction: *either* punishment *or* satisfaction, Lonergan seeks to integrate Anselm's satisfaction with the traditional understanding of Christ having been punished. Such an integration runs the risk of a possibly mistaken notion of divine justice, as shown by satisfassion, which is a possible yet harmful attempt at integration. By distinguishing different types of punishments and different contexts for punishments, Lonergan is able to integrate punishment with satisfaction while preserving divine justice. We shall examine first two types of punishments and then two contexts for these punishments.

3.2.1.1. The Divine Will, World Order, and Punishment

Did the Father punish the Son to satisfy for humanity's sins? Yes and no, depending on one's definition of punishment. Lonergan's answer begins with the general order of the universe as related to God's will: (1) God *directly wills* what is good and only what is good, (2) God does not in any way will “basic sin” but *permits* it, and (3) God *indirectly wills* “moral evil.”¹⁸⁹

The good (*bonum* in the original Latin) is God and all of created being insofar as it participates in divine goodness. Basic sin is *malum culpae*, also translated as “evil of fault” or “inner sin.” This would be what contemporary language understands as a sinful

¹⁸⁸ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 520-21: “According to scripture (Gen 2:17, 3:19; Wis 2:24; Rom 5:12, 6:23; compare 1 Cor 15:21-22, 15:26; Heb 2:14-15) death is the penalty of sin. But Christ died. Therefore Christ paid the penalty of sin.”

¹⁸⁹ Lonergan discusses this triad several places, including *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 514-515, 518, 544, and “The Redemption,” 12. *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 514. In this Lonergan follows Thomas, and he cites Thomas's *Summa Theologica*, I, q. 19, a. 9 c. and ad 3m.

choice. Moral evil is also called “evil of penalty” or “evil of punishment.”¹⁹⁰ But punishment here means something more general than common usage of someone is being forced to suffer an ill because of an offence. Lonergan uses the Latin for moral evil, *malum poenae*. *Malum* is “evil,” which Lonergan defines basically as a lack, privation, or failure of some good.¹⁹¹ *Poenae* is “punishment,” “penalty,” or “consequence.” Thus, *malum poenae* means simply the deprivation of some good as a consequence. And since *malum poenae* follows basic sin or evil of fault, the “evil of punishment” is the deprivation of some good as a consequence of sin.

This ordering of the evil of punishment as consequent to basic sin is central to Lonergan’s understanding of divine justice. In the existing world, created by divine wisdom and justice, sins have consequences. They cause the sinner and others affected by the sin to suffer the deprivation of a good or goods. This is how Lonergan makes sense of Paul’s statements about “the wrath of God” in Rom 1:18-3:19.¹⁹² God in infinite wisdom has seen it fit to create a world in which sins have negative consequences and good actions have positive consequences.¹⁹³

Such consequences of sin, built into the world order, are a kind of punishment “broadly speaking” (*latius*).¹⁹⁴ This is the kind of punishment that Lonergan understands Christ to have suffered. It is a consequence of sinful human action and willed by God, but only indirectly, as part of a world order in which human actions have both personal

¹⁹⁰ Hefling, “A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement,” 56-57.

¹⁹¹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 504.

¹⁹² *Ibid*, 515.

¹⁹³ Why this is exactly, Lonergan does not state explicitly, at least not here. My guess is that for freedom to be real, choices and actions must have real consequences.

¹⁹⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 505.

and social consequences. Thus, the direct cause of Christ's suffering is not the appeasement of the Father, but the sins of "Judas, the priests, the crowd, Pilate, the soldiers" and all of humanity.¹⁹⁵ What God directly willed for Christ in the passion was Christ's unconditional and unfailing love, even in the face of sin and its evil consequences.¹⁹⁶

While Lonergan maintains that in the sense of suffering the consequences of sin, or "broadly speaking," Christ was punished, he is adamant that "strictly speaking" Christ was not punished by God, either directly or indirectly. Let us clarify the distinction between broadly and strictly defined punishments. Punishment "broadly speaking" is any lack or privation of any good due to evil. The lack can be in external things, bodily goods, or goods of the soul. Though all lacks are evil, they are not all equally evil: "lack of bodily goods is worse, other things being equal, than lack of external goods, and lack of the soul's goods is worse still."¹⁹⁷ On the other hand, punishment "pure and simple" or "strictly speaking" (*strictus*) is a lack of such goods that is forced, imposed, or inflicted. Because such punishment goes against the will, freedom, or choice of the person punished, it always involves the deprivation of goods of the soul.¹⁹⁸

Christ's punishment cannot be understood as punishment in this strict, "pure and simple" sense, for Christ freely and willingly took on the penalty of sins. His suffering and death were not imposed on him by his Father; rather, he offered himself in

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 469. Cf. 452.

¹⁹⁶ This will be discussed in full in the fourth section where we examine thesis 17.

¹⁹⁷ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 505.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

redemption for all.¹⁹⁹ If we accept this, a further question may arise: Why did Christ willingly accept the consequences of other people's sins? The highpoint of Lonergan's answer is in thesis 17, but in 16 he takes the next step of distinguishing between punishment inflicted in the context of retribution and punishment taken on in satisfaction.

3.2.1.2. Two Contexts for Punishment: Retribution and Satisfaction

A part of divine justice is the ordering detailed above in which basic sin, inner sin, or evil of fault are followed by moral evil, evil of penalty, evil of punishment, or negative consequences. This part of divine justice Lonergan calls simply "evil follows evil." The other components of divine justice are called "good follows good," "good follows evil," and "evil follows good."²⁰⁰ All four sub-orderings are included in the one world order God has willed in infinite wisdom and justice.

In "evil follows good" we have an instance of basic sin, i.e., a person choosing to use his/her freedom and other good, natural gifts for evil. Both "good follows good" and "evil follows evil" are aspects of what Lonergan calls "vindictive" or "retributive" justice.²⁰¹ In both pairs, like is rewarded with like. The final ordering, "good follows evil," is also an aspect of divine justice, a part Lonergan calls "redemptive."²⁰² When good follows evil, there is operative a "principle of transformation [that] seems to be the essence of redemption, which is nothing else than this: out of the evils he permits, God brings a more excellent good."²⁰³ Lonergan focuses on this transformation in thesis 17, but satisfaction is one way of considering it. To see how, let us distinguish between two

¹⁹⁹ See, for example, section 2.5. above.

²⁰⁰ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 514-15.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.* These terms go back at least as far as Aristotle.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 504.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 544.

general contexts for punishment. We move now, not in the realm of divine justice, but in that of human justice, which shall then be used as an analogy for a deeper understanding of divine justice.

The first context for punishment is the more familiar of the two. This is retributive justice. Most basically, it involves, as above, the rewarding of good with good and evil with evil. Interestingly, Lonergan traces the beginning of the process involving retributive justice to the fact that human beings want everything, “the whole of being.” Concretely, “there are different wills that will different things with respect to the same goods.”²⁰⁴ Conflicts tend to arise, and in a conflict a number of persons involved may behave in an improper way, a way that justly offends others. This improper action, Lonergan calls *culpa*, a “fault,” and its effect on the person(s) offended is the “offense” (*offensa*). Fault affects the person at fault as well, creating *reatus*, or “guilt”—a liability, debt, or desert (*debitum*) of penalty or punishment (*poenae*).²⁰⁵

The punishment or penalty must be “imposed” or “inflicted” (*inflicta*) by some “proper official. The party at fault gives “payment” (*solutio*) of the penalty or punishment. For punishment to be imposed justly, the person punished must be at fault, the punishment must be in line with the gravity of the fault, and it must be imposed in the right manner and circumstances (for example, not with delight in the pain inflicted). Otherwise the punishment is considered savage, cruel, and/or illicit.”²⁰⁶

²⁰⁴ Ibid., 504-05.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 505-06.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 506-07. Lonergan refers the reader to Thomas’s *Summa Theologica*, II-II, q. 108, a. 1; q. 159, a. 2.

Such is the first context for just punishment, retributive justice. Satisfaction is the second. Lonergan notes that in Roman commercial law, when a person could not or would not fulfill a contract, the court would impose a penalty/punishment called satisfaction.²⁰⁷ This was a payment of something acceptable to a creditor. Lonergan defines satisfaction differently, however.

Most simply and broadly, satisfaction for Lonergan occurs when a person offers an offended party something that the offended party values as much as or more than the offended party was harmed by the offense. He quotes Thomas: “Properly speaking, one makes satisfaction for offense by offering the one who is offended something that pleases him as much as, or more than, he hated the offense.”²⁰⁸ One might notice two differences between such satisfaction and satisfaction under Roman law (at least as portrayed by Lonergan). Lonergan’s satisfaction is *offered*, not imposed. Secondly, it is an offer of something *as* pleasing as or *more* pleasing than the offense is displeasing.

The first difference is also the central distinction between satisfaction and retribution/retributive justice, as Lonergan understands them. The process of satisfaction begins likewise with fault, something deserved, and an offense. But then someone seeks “pardon” (*venia*), also called the forgiveness or remission of the offense (*offensae remissio*). Finally, the party offended may grant pardon.²⁰⁹

The granting of pardon, forgiveness, or remission of offense is not necessary, though it may be appropriate or fitting (*conveniens*). One key to this appropriateness is

²⁰⁷ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 506-07.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 486, with quote from *Summa Theologica*, III, q. 48, a. 2.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 507-508.

that the person seeking pardon willingly takes on the penalty owed for the offense. This penalty is not punishment in the strict sense but it is a punishment “broadly speaking,” inasmuch as it involves some consequence that resulted from the fault. Furthermore, pardon is appropriately granted when the party making satisfaction not only pays a penalty, but openly shows “sorrow over the offense and detestation of the fault” (*dolor de offensa culpaque detestatio*).²¹⁰

Detestation of the fault is a very specific feeling with weighty content. It “regards sin as evil and presupposes a judgment of value: it denotes a deliberate, willful hatred.”²¹¹ Lonergan defines sorrow heuristically. It “stands to a present evil as delight stands to a present good.”²¹² Sorrow presupposes love of the party offended, detestation of the fault, and the fact that the fault is against the party offended.²¹³ It is not simply a commercial transaction or a strict exchange but a matter of interpersonal relationships. It seeks not merely a zero-sum balance, but reconciliation.²¹⁴

Lonergan summarizes satisfaction and gives a short example:

It is compensation, as it were, for offense, where compensation is thought of along the lines of interpersonal relationship, not commercial transaction. If one person is offended, for example, another could say, “Good! He got what he deserved,” and so the offense would not be taken away but made worse. But the second person could instead be

²¹⁰ Ibid., 508-09. The quoted text from 509.

²¹¹ Ibid., 487. See also Hefling, “A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement,” 70. Viewed in the context of *Method*, detestation would operate on the fourth level, the level of deliberation. Here feelings have been weighed, judged to correspond to reality, to truth and value. Furthermore, as deliberate, these feelings orient a person existentially, or really, and not merely notionally. A helpful secondary source on this is Brian Cronin’s *Value Ethics: A Lonergan Perspective* (Nairobi, Kenya: Consolata Institute of Philosophy, 2006).

²¹² Ibid., referring us Thomas’s treatment of sorrow in *Summa Theologica*, I-II, qq. 35-39

²¹³ Lonergan does not state this explicitly. He states, “*Sorrow over offenses against God* presupposes love towards God, detestation of sin, and the fact of sin’s being against God” [*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 487]. I do not think it is a large leap to generalize from offense against God and sin to offense against any offended party and fault.

²¹⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 490, 508, 539. On 539, Lonergan refers us to Rom 5:10, 2 Cor. 5:19.

outraged at the offense, denounce its injustice, and in every way show that he takes sides not with the offender but with the offended. There is a way in which the offense would be made less, there would be compensation for it, satisfaction would be made.²¹⁵

Clearly there is a difference between such satisfaction and retribution. The difference is satisfaction's focus on interiority and interpersonal relationships—punishment willingly taken on, pardon sought and granted, detestation and sorrow felt and shared, reconciliation.

Within this interpersonal conception of satisfaction, the question could arise: If, after punishment is willingly taken on, detestation and sorrow are expressed, and the offense is pardoned, might it not be appropriate for the *punishment* to be forgiven as well? Lonergan answers in the affirmative: "It is appropriate for punishment to be remitted as a consequence of pardon, the remission of offense. Anyone who really does forgive his brother's offense with all his heart (Mt 18:35) and is reconciled with him does not think further of demanding punishment."²¹⁶

This makes it seem as though satisfaction and punishment are incompatible. However, Lonergan maintains that they are compatible, because even if and when the person offended forgives the offender, the offender can be moved out of inner love, detestation, and sorrow to freely and willingly take on a punishment.²¹⁷ Again, when this is the case, the punishment is not punishment in the strict sense (as in context of retributive justice, where punishment is simply imposed), but it is a kind of punishment, "broadly speaking."

²¹⁵ Ibid., 492.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 509.

²¹⁷ It would seem, too, that these negative feelings, if fervent, are a kind of punishment in themselves, though Lonergan does not say this.

Lonergan presents a scriptural passage illustrating the two contexts:

Mt 5:23-26. “So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar, and first go to be reconciled with your brother, and then come and offer your gift. Make friends quickly with your accuser, while on the road with him; lest your accuser hand you over to the judge, and the judge hand you over to the officer, and you be put in prison. Truly, I say to you, you will not come out of there, until you have paid the last penny.”

This passage is about seeking and granting pardon (“something against you,” “be reconciled,” “make friends”) as distinguished from inflicting punishment (the judge, the officer, prison, the last penny). Compare *Mt 6:12, 6:14-15; Mt 18:21-35; Mk 11:25-26; Lk 7:47, 17:3-4*. These passages drive home very forcefully a Christian teaching known to all.²¹⁸

Having distinguished clearly the two contexts, Lonergan makes three further moves. First, he states that other than satisfaction and retribution there are no other possibilities for restoring divine justice “in this present order of reality.”²¹⁹ This is his definition of the “severity” of divine justice.²²⁰ Secondly, he writes that while these two contexts are conceptually distinct, they are not entirely exclusive of one another. In fact, “in the concrete complexity of human affairs they are often mixed up and seldom entirely separate.”²²¹ People are rarely either perfectly repentant or entirely unrepentant. Punishment is usually received in a manner both imposed and taken on, to varying degrees.

Finally, Lonergan points to the last significant difference between satisfaction and retribution. While punishment in retribution is *justly imposed* only to the party *at fault*, satisfaction may be *offered justly* by someone *other than* the guilty party. This is true,

²¹⁸ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 507-08.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 490. In this pairing, Lonergan follows Tertullian, *De pudicitia*, 2 in *Patrologia Latina*, edited by J. P. Migne (221 volumes, 1844-1864) 2: 985 and Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, II-II, q. 159, a. 2 and III, q. 47, a. 3 *ad 1m*. See also 496, 504.

²²⁰ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 504.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 503.

because in satisfaction the punishment is not imposed but freely taken on. Satisfaction made by someone other than the party at fault is called “vicarious satisfaction.”

Why would an innocent person freely undergo punishment for another’s offense?

This is the topic for our next section.

3.2.2. Satisfaction and Friendship

3.2.2.1. Vicarious Satisfaction and Friendship

Before turning to vicarious satisfaction, let us first review satisfaction simply and its relation to punishment. Throughout thesis 16, Lonergan is careful to say that punishment in a pure or ideal context of satisfaction is never *incurred* because *imposed*, but is freely *taken on*.²²² Because of this fact, a person moved by knowledge of the offense and love for the offended party can express detestation of the fault and sorrow for the offense. This expression can do much to heal the damage of the offense and promote reconciliation.

Vicarious satisfaction maintains that this healing can be achieved by someone other than the person who committed the fault. This assertion raises questions. One question regards the reasons or motives for such a vicarious act. Why would anyone willingly take on another’s just punishment? A further, perhaps more fundamental, question regards not the motive of vicarious satisfaction but its outcome: If the aim of satisfaction, as Lonergan conceives it, is not simply a payment of debt but interpersonal reconciliation, then even if a third party offers satisfaction and the offended forgives the offense, then might not the offender still remain unrepentant and thus unreconciled?

²²² Although in concrete living, when remorse is imperfect, punishments can be to some degree both incurred and taken on, as above.

Lonergan admits this possibility.²²³ His answer to both of the above questions and the key to his version of vicarious satisfaction is the love of friendship. To be clear, what is needed is a two-fold friendship on the part of the person offering vicarious satisfaction. There needs to be friendship between not only the one making satisfaction and the party offended, but also a friendship between the one making satisfaction and the party at fault.²²⁴ In offering satisfaction, the mutual friend becomes a mediator of friendship. The offended and the offender become friends. How does this work?

Lonergan defines vicarious satisfaction as “voluntarily taking on punishment so that pardon for another’s offenses, not one’s own, may appropriately be asked and granted. The foundation of vicarious satisfaction is a union of wills by love.”²²⁵

When two are joined in love—as is the case in friendship—one will freely pay the debts of another. According to Aristotle, “‘What we can accomplish through the efforts of our friends we seem to do ourselves’ (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, III, iii, 13; 1112b).”²²⁶ In this case, if two are joined in love, one friend’s suffering will be shared by the other. Furthermore, according to Thomas, “‘one will regard punishment suffered for his sake by a friend as if he himself suffered: and thus he is not without punishment, provided he suffers along with his suffering friend, all the more so, the more he is himself

²²³ Ibid., 510-11.

²²⁴ Lonergan does not state that friendship between the offended person and the one satisfying is required. However, it is implied by the fact that one makes satisfaction by detestation of fault and sorrow for offense, and sorrow is produced not only by detestation of the offense but also by love for the person offended. Of course, friendship is a mutual love, and the love might be felt only by the one satisfying. If I was mugged on the street, I would think that a stranger’s expression of sympathy would be to some degree satisfying. This might be possible by the minimal friendship we share as human. See Ch. 1, sections 1.3.3. and 1.5. for humanity as naturally social.

²²⁵ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 510. For more on this union, Lonergan refers us to Thomas’s *Summa Theologica* I-II, q. 28, aa. 1 and 2.

²²⁶ Ibid., 511. This quotation comes from within a quotation of Thomas, *Summa contra Gentiles*, III, 158, §7.

the cause of the suffering.”²²⁷

This is how vicarious satisfaction works. It is how a third party’s satisfaction can bring an offender to repentance and into reconciled relationship with the one offended. The crucial point is that if my friend suffers, I suffer, and if (s)he suffered *for* me, *because* of me, then my suffering is made all the more painful. This is the perhaps the most important aspect of Lonergan’s understanding of vicarious satisfaction. In a way that significantly departs from popular imagination, Lonergan’s view of vicarious satisfaction does not focus on physical pain or financial payment, but on interior movements: knowledge, love, detestation, and sorrow. If my friend was moved by (1) love for me, (2) love for the one I have offended, (3) the knowledge that my fault was offensive, (4) detestation of my fault, and (5) sorrow for my offense, then I would be moved out of loving unity with my friend to the same inner movements, to the same judgments, feelings, and decisions. I would—to the degree that I was truly loving—take a stand not with me and my fault, but with the offended party against my fault. I would repent and reconcile.

3.2.2.2. The Supernatural Friendship of Charity

The vicarious satisfaction discussed above is possible, though not likely, in a purely natural context. In the actually existing world, however, everything is a product of nature, sin and grace, to different degrees. In this world, if such vicarious satisfaction were to take place, it would probably occur through a friendship based, to some degree, on the supernatural gift of charity. In any case, Lonergan is clear that one particular type

²²⁷ Ibid., with quotation from *Summa contra Gentiles*, III, 158, §7.

of vicarious satisfaction is possible only through the grace of charity. This is the satisfaction for someone who is not already one's friend, perhaps even an enemy.

A natural, mutual friendship would allow friends to satisfy for friends. But in order for vicarious satisfaction to work (i.e., to end in reconciliation) among people who are not friends, the one making satisfaction would have to be moved by the supernatural love of charity. This charity would then draw out love in the unfriendly offender. Again the goal is reconciliation, a union of love.

Lonergan presents this distinction briefly: "In the natural order, friendship between the offender and the maker of satisfaction not only grounds but also *precedes* the satisfaction made. In the supernatural order, however, the love of charity in the one who makes satisfaction *brings out* a similar love in the offender."²²⁸

In sum, vicarious satisfaction in the context of charity is not grounded on a mutual friendship between the one satisfying and the one satisfied for. Rather, it is based on a one-sided love, the love of charity *for* the one satisfied and *in* the one satisfying. This initially one-sided charity can move a person to make satisfaction for an enemy and can move the one satisfied for to love the one who has made satisfaction. Eventually, on consideration of this new friend's actions, a charitable satisfaction can inspire the offender to repeat her/his new friend's detestation and sorrow. This will produce mutual friendship not merely between these two parties, but among all three involved: the offender, the one making charitable vicarious satisfaction, and the one offended. Again, only a vicarious satisfaction made out of the supernatural love of charity can start with an

²²⁸ Ibid., emphasis added. We will discuss how charity "brings out" love in section 4.3.5.

offender who loves no one, neither the person offended nor the one making satisfaction for his/her faults.

3.2.3. Christ's Satisfaction and Christian Satisfaction

Christ's satisfaction is all of the above. On the cross, Christ has made satisfaction for us and has received punishment for our sins. He was punished in two broad senses: (1) he suffered the negative consequences of human sin, the consequences built into the world order, and (2) he willingly took on these consequences as an appropriate way of expressing many things: his love for the Father, his knowledge that human faults are offensive to God, his detestation of these faults/sins, his sorrow for the offense, and his charitable love for all of humanity.

This satisfaction integrated with punishment is not satisfassion. Christ's suffering on the cross is not an act of retribution, but of satisfaction. The Father did not inflict punishment on the Son in vicarious retribution for debt of human sin. Rather, Christ willingly took on this suffering as an expression of his concord of his will with the Father's will. Christ's suffering in itself was neither willed by nor pleasing to the Father. Rather, what the Father willed and was pleased by was Christ's interior responses to sin, namely his love for God and humanity, his sorrow for the rupture in the relationship between God and humanity that sin causes, and his detestation of sin itself. Christ's acceptance of the consequences of our sin communicated this love, sorrow, and detestation to God on behalf of humanity. In doing so, it satisfied the requirements of divine justice, however, we must remember that in satisfying for our sins, Christ does not earn divine love and forgiveness as a consequence. Instead, divine love and forgiveness

are there from the outset. Christ's satisfaction is a divine initiative. It flows from eternal, divine love and forgiveness. It is an effort on our behalf, even while we are not friends with God. It works to reconcile human beings to God, to draw out love from us sinners and to make us friends with Christ and with God.

Because of this, the analogy of vicarious satisfaction breaks down to some extent. In a human community, vicarious satisfaction often produces a change in heart in the person *to whom* satisfaction is offered, namely forgiveness, and secondarily it may produce a change of heart in the person *for whom* satisfaction is given, namely repentance. While Christ's vicarious satisfaction is in some sense primarily a communication to God on behalf of humanity, still its most significant intended consequence is not to change the "heart" or "mind" of God, but to transform the hearts and minds of sinful human persons.

This transformation is effected not through the normal means of vicarious satisfaction, i.e. when the one making satisfaction and the one satisfied for are already friends. Rather, it is possible only through the divine friendship of charity. As Aristotle wrote, through friendship two become as one. Thomas follows Aristotle on friendship but adds a particularly Christian element: the effect of the supernatural love of charity. Thus Thomas believes that "friendship makes two persons into one through sympathy, and chiefly by the love that is charity."²²⁹

"To this the council of Trent adds its authority: '...in making satisfaction for our sins, we are made like to Christ Jesus, who satisfied for our sins... We also have the

²²⁹ Ibid., quoting from *Summa contra Gentiles*, III, 158, §7.

certain pledge that if we suffer with him we shall also be glorified with him.”²³⁰ In coming to detest our sins and be sorry that they offend God, we come to a union of heart and mind with Christ and with God, the one who makes vicarious satisfaction and the one offended.

If the “story” of Christ’s charitable, vicarious satisfaction were to end there, it would already be astonishing. However, there is one final aspect to it. The interpersonal relationships involved in satisfaction are not simply vertical ones between God and the sinner, mediated through Christ. Through Christ’s satisfaction for us and for our sins, we are drawn to suffer for our own sins, to detest them, to be sorrowful for their offense to God, and to return to God in a union of love. But this is not all we are called to do. Once we have repented our own sins and been reconciled to God in the supernatural friendship of charity, we are also called and moved by charity to participate in Christ’s work of vicarious satisfaction for the sins of others. This brings into play a kind of horizontal aspect to satisfaction. The circle of friends expands. Repentance and reconciliation spread throughout the world and across history.²³¹

Lonergan cautions, however, that “the greatest care should be taken not to read this in Pelagian terms.”²³² One’s satisfaction for one’s own sins and for the sins of others is made possible only by Christ’s satisfaction. It is the mutual love of the Father and the Son that moves Christ. It is Christ’s divine love for God and humanity that enables him to satisfy for our sins, and it is this divine love, extended to us while we are yet sinners,

²³⁰ Ibid., 548, with reference to DB 904; DS 1690.

²³¹ Ibid., 512. Lonergan does not use the words “vertical” and “horizontal.”

²³² Ibid., 511.

that enables us to reconcile with God and our neighbor. Satisfaction for the sins of others who are not our friends is possible, in theory and in practice, only through God's supernatural gift of charity and God's own friendship, "that friendship which consists in a communication of divine blessedness."²³³

Lonergan summarizes this dependence: "Christian vicarious satisfaction is founded on a union of love such that the love itself belongs to Christ, on account of the fullness of grace that is properly his. No one else has this love except through Christ's merit and his satisfaction itself."²³⁴ The satisfaction that Christians make is only analogical to Christ's satisfaction. In addition to being dependent on Christ's work, Christian satisfaction is always a mixed product. One satisfies for the sin of others, but also for one's own sins. And one's detestation and sorrow are never perfect, therefore one's suffering of punishment is never simply taken on freely. It is to some degree imposed out of retributive justice. Christ's vicarious satisfaction, however, is purely vicarious and simply satisfaction, for Christ was free from sin, both original and personal.²³⁵

Lonergan makes eight final arguments about Christ's satisfaction. First, Christ made "material satisfaction" for sins. The material component of satisfaction involves the basic scriptural ways of discussing redemption, the ones Lonergan presented in thesis 15. Material satisfaction denotes "that by divine judgment Christ the man suffered and died for sinners and on account of sins; that he offered himself, a sacrifice to God, for the

²³³ Ibid. Lonergan refers the reader to Thomas's *Summa Theologica*, II-II, q. 23, a. 1.

²³⁴ Ibid., 512.

²³⁵ Ibid., 512-513. On p. 512 Lonergan notes: "What we say about Christ should in a way be understood as applying also to the blessed Virgin by reason of her immaculate conception."

total remission of sin and the reconciliation of all sinners with God; and that this end has been achieved by his blood.”²³⁶ The material component of Christ’s satisfaction is his suffering and death for us and for our sins.²³⁷ It is the payment of the price of redemption.²³⁸ It is Christ’s willingly taking on the consequences of our sin.²³⁹ It is an expiation for sin.²⁴⁰ These biblical words and phrases are the “bare fact” of redemption. Satisfaction is the intelligible context for understanding these bare facts. It is the answer to the question, “*on what basis is it true* that there is an expiation [as well as price paid, etc.] for the sins of others in Christ’s suffering and dying?”²⁴¹

This formal aspect of satisfaction is Lonergan’s second point. “Formally, you have a notion of satisfaction in so far as attention is given to the seriousness of sin as an offense against God...”²⁴² Satisfaction is a “higher viewpoint,”²⁴³ a way of preserving, unifying, and relating the facts of Christ’s suffering, paying a price, etc. Satisfaction raises these elements into the intelligible context not of commercial transaction but of interpersonal relationships. Here, sin is thought of as offense rupturing relationship. Satisfaction is not simply suffering and punishment but suffering and punishment as freely taken on to express love, detestation of sin, and sorrow for offense. Suffering and death are taken on for the purpose of establishing reconciliation. This is the form of Christ’s vicarious suffering and death, his sacrifice, etc., where form is the higher

²³⁶ Ibid., 491.

²³⁷ Ibid., 488, 537-38,

²³⁸ Ibid., 538.

²³⁹ Ibid., 523.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 488, 537, 539.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 489, emphasis added.

²⁴² Ibid., 491.

²⁴³ Hefling “A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement,” 75. Cf. *Insight*, 259.

viewpoint, the larger context for understanding.²⁴⁴

Lonergan's third and fourth arguments are that satisfaction is "adequate" (*condigne*) and even "superabundant" (*superabundanter*). Romans 5:20 states that "grace has superabounded." Clement VI affirmed that one drop of Christ's blood would have sufficed to redeem the whole race, and Thomas argues for the superabundance of satisfaction.²⁴⁵ These pertain to the rationale for Anselm's requirement of the "God-Human" and to the distinction made by Thomas in his definition of satisfaction as "offering the one who is offended something that pleases him as much as, or more than, he hated the offense."²⁴⁶ The point of this is not that God is placated by Christ's offering of love, detestation, and sorrow expressed in his passion. The point is that no matter how serious the evil of sin is, the goodness of Christ's satisfaction is as great and even far greater. Lonergan agrees with Anselm that this is due fundamentally to Christ's infinite dignity as a divine person. "Just as sin is measured by the dignity of the person offended, so too satisfaction is measured by the dignity of the person who makes satisfaction for the offense."²⁴⁷ Additionally, Lonergan agrees with Thomas that the abundance and superabundance of Christ's satisfaction is caused by Christ's perfect love, since "the more love increases, the less there is a need for punishment, either satisfactory or purgative."²⁴⁸

Lonergan's fifth argument is that God directly willed Christ's satisfaction. The key to this is the fact that the event of Christ's suffering and death is the result not merely

²⁴⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 537-39.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 541-42. Clement VI: DB550, DS 1025. Thomas, *Summa Theologica* q. 48, q.2.

²⁴⁶ See note 208.

²⁴⁷ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 541.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 540. Lonergan refers to Thomas, *Summa contra Gentiles* III, 158, §6.

of the divine will but of multiple wills: (1) God does not will (but permits) sin in general and the particular sins of Pilate, the high priests, and the rest. Their willful choices led directly to Christ's suffering. (2) God indirectly wills the negative consequences of sin, which Christ suffered. (3) God wills the good alone, this is Christ's satisfaction, his acceptance of suffering as an expression of his love for God and humanity and of his detestation and sorrow over sin.²⁴⁹

Sixth, in the whole work of redemption there is operative some kind of principle of transformation (*quasi principium transformationis*). Things that are negative in themselves are transformed through satisfaction into goods in some sense. The evil effects of sin become the material of satisfaction. Death, the ultimate penalty of sin, becomes a principle of salvation, of restoration to new life in the resurrection. The "curse of the law" becomes the "blessing of Abraham" (Gal 3:13-14). And the "effects of sin" become "the effects of God's righteousness" (2 Cor 5:21).²⁵⁰

The principle of transformation seems to be the "essence of redemption." This principle is "out of the evils he permits, God brings a more excellent good."²⁵¹ Lonergan is referring to a quote by Augustine that he gave earlier, "God 'judged it better to bring good out of evil than not to allow evil to exist' (*Enchiridion*, 27; *ML*, 40: 245)."²⁵²

God permits sin and indirectly wills the evils of punishment in order to bring forth good. Satisfaction is one way of bringing out good from evil or transforming evil into good. From the evil of penalty owed to divine retributive justice, God, in Christ's work

²⁴⁹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 542-43.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 544.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.* This good ultimately is reconciliation, but it is also, on p. 519, "the Body of Christ and the church, militant, suffering, and triumphant."

²⁵² *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 515.

of satisfaction, draws forth the good of a redemption that is reconciliation. Satisfaction operates not against divine justice, but according to a type of divine justice Lonergan calls “redemptive” (i.e. satisfaction).²⁵³

Seventh, Lonergan advises that it is best to understand Christ’s satisfaction not through an analogy of the courts but through the sacrament of penance.²⁵⁴ In both satisfaction and penance punishment is not imposed, but rather is willingly taken on out of repentance. In both, God’s love and forgiveness are not earned but are given freely. In both, what matters is the person’s inner movements of love, detestation, and sorrow. And in both, relationship—not payment—is primary.²⁵⁵

This analogy of the sacrament of penance is appropriate, because the original use of the term “satisfaction” in ecclesial discourse was not in soteriology but in sacramental theology. It arose in the third century in regard to personal sins and penance.²⁵⁶ The Council of Trent “puts the word ‘satisfaction’ in the context of contrition and confession; in other words, the three acts of the penitent in the sacrament of penance are contrition, confession, and satisfaction.”²⁵⁷ Contrition itself is of three parts: detestation of sin, sorrow for sin, and firm purpose of amendment. The analogy is useful for understanding in general the relationships among God’s love, punishment, and repentance, as above. Still, it is not perfectly applied to Christ’s work, for Jesus was without sin and thus in no need of confession for past sin nor firm purpose of amendment.

Eighth, and finally, Lonergan argues that satisfaction is an expression

²⁵³ Ibid., 504.

²⁵⁴ Lonergan believes that this is not unlike Anselm’s understanding of the term.

²⁵⁵ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 545-47. For more on repentance and the difference it makes, see p. 529.

²⁵⁶ “The Redemption,” 20.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., 22.

(*expressionem*). In addition to the utmost detestation of sins and an utmost sorrow over offense, Christ's satisfaction communicates a perfect knowledge and perfect love of God and humanity, for these are fundamental to Christ's utmost detestation and sorrow. The knowledge is what traditional theology calls the "beatific vision." By this Christ knows both God by his essence and the totality of sin. The love is a perfect charity. The resulting perfect detestation and sorrow proceeds from Christ the man on the basis of both his divine will and his human will. It does not remain an internal act but is expressed outwardly and materially through a vicarious suffering and death. No other human being had this perfect knowledge and love, and, thus, no other human being could have made the satisfying expression that Christ made.²⁵⁸

Furthermore, Christ's passion expresses not only a human detestation of all sins and a human sorrow over all offenses, but it expresses God's own hatred of sin.

Lonergan turns to scripture:

"God ... sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin ... condemned sin the flesh, in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit" (Rom 8:3). The fact that in the suffering and death of Christ God expressed his judgment on sin can, it seems, be understood the words "condemned sin in the flesh."²⁵⁹

To conclude this chapter on the analogy of satisfaction, let us recall that satisfaction is not to be understood along the lines of "substitutionary penal atonement" or any type of "satispassion." The cross is not God the Father punishing his Son in order to please himself and settle a debt to his honor. Understood according to Lonergan's definition of satisfaction, the cross is Christ's expression of both the evils of sin and the

²⁵⁸ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 548-49.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 551. Cf. 491.

goodness of God. It is a personal, visible manifestation of these truths. It is a communication within ruptured interpersonal relationships. It brings forth in the sinner the same feelings, judgments, and expressions of detestation, sorrow, and love. It flows from divine friendship, is given to humanity in charity, and seeks as its end reconciliation. Thus, we have Lonergan's sixteenth thesis of *The Incarnate Word*:

Christ has made satisfaction for our sins, not only adequately but superabundantly as well. This satisfaction, understood on a sacramental analogy, thus adds to his vicarious suffering and death an expression of utmost detestation for of all sins and utmost sorrow over every offense against God.²⁶⁰

²⁶⁰ Ibid., 486. "Christus pro peccatis nostris non solum condigne sed etiam superabundanter satisfecit; quae quidem satisfactio secundum analogiam sacramentalem intelligitur; et ideo vicariae passioni et morti addit expressionem summae detestationis omnium peccatorum et summi doloris de omni offensa Dei" (*DVI*, 486).

Chapter 4. The Law of the Cross: A Communication Primarily to Humanity

Not all theological insights are equal. As Lonergan notes, progress is “often enough... not merely from ignorance to truth but from error to truth.”²⁶¹ Some of his work he considered to be true in a way that was “permanently valid” (as mentioned in this part’s introduction). Thesis 16 of *The Incarnate Word*, “Christ’s Satisfaction,” is probably one example²⁶² and thesis 17, “Understanding the Mystery” is even more clearly so.²⁶³

That thesis 17 is one of Lonergan’s greatest developments is clear, but it is not clear exactly how great it is. As presented above in section 1.2.5., Lonergan affirmed in “The Redemption,” that when seeking to understand the mystery of redemption, it is best to consider multiple analogies. However, later in the same essay and immediately after considering the multiple analogies of Thomas Aquinas, Lonergan writes that mystery in the sense of “God’s hidden plan” is “the fundamental category” for moving towards a “total view” of redemption.²⁶⁴

Another contender for this unified view is thesis 17’s presentation of the “Law of the Cross” as noted by the editors of *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1958-*

²⁶¹ *Method*, 44.

²⁶² Hefling, “A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement,” 1.

²⁶³ At a 1966 address to the Canon Law Society of America, Lonergan lauds his presentation of “the dynamic structure of human history” in *Insight* and “its strictly theological complement” in thesis 17 of *The Incarnate Word*. “The Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical Mindedness,” 7.

²⁶⁴ “The Redemption,” 24.

1965.²⁶⁵ I am not sure what the editors' grounds are for believing the Law of the Cross to be the single or overarching view of redemption. They simply posit that Lonergan achieved a "unified understanding" in the Law of the Cross as was his tendency (more to follow). However, I believe that several points would support their view: (1) In "The Redemption," Lonergan argues that the way to move towards a "total view" of redemption is in the category of mystery. (2) The official title of thesis 17 is "Understanding the Mystery." (3) Mystery in both works is understood as a *secretum consilium*, "secret counsel" or "hidden plan."²⁶⁶ (4) In thesis 17, Lonergan explains that the hidden plan, now revealed, is best understood according to the *lex crucis*, the "Law of the Cross."²⁶⁷ (5) Although "Understanding the Mystery" was the official title of thesis 17, Lonergan often referred to it as the "Law of the Cross."²⁶⁸

In short, if mystery in the sense of God's hidden plan is the total view, and the Law of the Cross explains the mystery, then it would seem that the Law of the Cross is the total view of redemption. Furthermore, Lonergan calls the Law of the Cross "the essence of redemption" and "the intrinsic intelligibility of redemption."²⁶⁹ Finally, in "The Redemption," Lonergan's discussion of mystery as the total view and hidden plan is followed immediately by an understanding of mystery in terms of the Law of the Cross ("the victory of suffering," "accepting the consequences of sin," "the transformation of the world," "the transformation of evil into good," "overcome evil with good"), though

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 14, note 26. The editors are Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran.

²⁶⁶ *DVI*, 583-84 and "The Redemption," 24-25.

²⁶⁷ *DVI*, 573, 583-84

²⁶⁸ See note 105, above.

²⁶⁹ "Lex crucis est essentia redemptionis... Sed redemptionis intelligibilitas intrinseca est lex crucis" *DVI*, 577.

the Law of the Cross is not actually named.²⁷⁰

How do we reconcile Lonergan's caution to use multiple analogies with his explicit and implied claims for the Law of the Cross? The editors of *Collected Works* do not view this as a conflict between two fixed positions but a growing unity of two aspects of thought. They present three factors involved in this growing unity: (1) Lonergan's heritage from Anselm who misguidedly sought unity in necessity and from Thomas who "was content to leave his understanding spread over five aspects," (2) Lonergan's "habitual orientation toward a unified understanding," and (3) "the unity Lonergan actually achieved in his understanding of the redemption through the law of the cross."²⁷¹ I am not completely convinced that the Law of the Cross is a unified, all-encompassing analogy for understanding redemption, but it is possible, and the law is certainly one of Lonergan's two most privileged analogies for redemption (along with satisfaction).²⁷²

Thesis 17, or the Law of the Cross, states:

This is why the Son of God became man, suffered, died, and was raised again: because divine wisdom has ordained and divine goodness has willed, not to do away with the evils of the human race through power, but to convert those evils into a supreme good according to the just and mysterious Law of the Cross.²⁷³

We shall consider the Law of the Cross in three parts, focusing first on how it is a law, then on the functioning of the law as instituted by Christ, and finally on the

²⁷⁰ "The Redemption," 28.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 14; editors' note 26.

²⁷² In some ways the two converge. Satisfaction operates by transformation, and one good that could be converted from evils is satisfaction. Charles Hefling notes that in a mysterious, unpublished work (often called *De Bono et Malo* after the title of its first chapter) Lonergan reversed the order of presentation "so that his discussion of satisfaction presupposes and expands on what he has already said about the *lex crucis*" ("A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement," 52).

²⁷³ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 552. "Dei Filius ideo homo factus, passus, mortuus, et resuscitatus est, quia divina sapientia ordinavit et divina bonitas voluit, non per potentiam mala generis humani auferre, sed secundum iustam atque mysteriosam crucis legem eadem mala in summum quoddam bonum convertere" (*DVI*, 552).

functioning of the law in Christians.

4.1. Why a Law of the Cross?

4.1.1. Four Causes and Redemption: Introducing a Form

For a while I struggled with the question of what exactly the Law of the Cross is. Given what Lonergan believes about analogy and mystery, I believe it to be an analogy for understanding the redemption, but what is it an analogy of? Communication? Transformation? Conversion? Acceptance? Unconditional Love? Overcoming? All of these realities play key roles in the Law of the Cross. The title of thesis 17's lone preliminary note is promising: "The analogy for this question." Here Lonergan discusses understanding as grasping "many objects in a single view" and analogy as helpful for gaining such a grasp. Surprisingly, the analogy he selects is the four causes of Aristotle.²⁷⁴ I believe that the point of this is not that the Law of the Cross should be called an analogy of the four causes, but that the four causes provide a way of understanding the Law of the Cross.

The four causes answer important questions about redemption: What for? (end); By whom? (agent); Of what? (matter); and In what way/pattern? (form). This is indeed helpful for a single view of redemption. But how are they related to the Law of the Cross? Lonergan does not directly answer this question. The causes seem to provide both a larger context for understanding the Law of the Cross and a way of discussing particular parts of the Law of the Cross.

As context, the four causes provide a general definition of law: a law expresses

²⁷⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 565.

how a certain form is established in a given matter by some agent for a particular end.

The Law of the Cross expresses how the reign of God is established in sinful humanity by Christ for restored order in the world and more intimate relationship with God. But if the Law of the Cross itself is to be understood as the single view, the essence, or the intrinsic intelligibility of redemption, it must include an understanding of redemption according to the four causes. Indeed over the course of thesis 17, Lonergan incorporates end, agent, matter, and form into the Law of the Cross. The Law of the Cross presents the four causes in their dynamic relations, in my opinion. In any case, it is helpful to distinguish the end, agent, matter, and form.

To ease in the reader into the complexity of redemption, Lonergan presents a simple example of building a house. Here the end is the form produced in the material, i.e. the finished house. The matter is the building materials, the stones, wood, etc. The form is the proposed ordering of the parts into a whole. The agent transforms the material according to the form into its end. In this example, the agent is the person or the people who actually construct(s) the house.²⁷⁵

In the example above, the four causes pertain to a kind of craftsmanship, the work of an artisan. The same is true for Christ's work of redemption. "In the economy of salvation, the *matter* is the human race, infected with original sin, burdened with actual sins, entangled in the penalties of sin, alienated from God, and divided within itself both individually and socially."²⁷⁶ Human persons are distinct from such matter as wood and stone not only by sin, alienation, and division, but fundamentally by their rationality,

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 566.

²⁷⁶ Ibid.

their freedom, and their social nature (as presented in part 1, chapter 1).

There is both an intrinsic and an extrinsic *end* to salvation. God is the extrinsic end. The intrinsic end is “the very order of the universe.”²⁷⁷ These ends are not separated, however, for God “communicates himself to creatures, both substantially (in the hypostatic union) and accidentally (in the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit and in giving himself to be seen by the blessed).”²⁷⁸ Furthermore, the order of the universe is an order of humanity in communion with the divine good, it is brought about through divine gifts of wisdom (faith now, vision later) and charity, and we reach the fullness of wisdom only in the final vision of God. Thus, the end is obtained in two stages, as “pilgrims” who live by faith and as the “blessed” who comprehend according to the vision of God.²⁷⁹ In traditional Christian language, this is the communion of saints, the kingdom or reign of God.²⁸⁰

This end is the “supreme good” in thesis 17. It is the actualization of the form of redemption. The *form* is:

the whole Christ, Head and members. For in the whole Christ there is grasped both the threefold communication of the divine good itself, and also that order which is an order of persons in the communication of the divine good and which is brought about through wisdom of apprehension and charity of will, either as pertains to the stage belonging to this life or as pertains to the stage of the life to come.²⁸¹

The *agent* who actualizes the form in the matter is Christ. Christ is a unique agent, fully human and fully divine, like us in all things yet entirely without sin and in

²⁷⁷ Ibid., Lonergan refers the reader to Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, I, q. 103, a. 2 c and ad 3m.

²⁷⁸ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 566. Cf. 554.

²⁷⁹ Ibid.

²⁸⁰ Lonergan does not use the term “communion of saints” in any of his writings, to my knowledge. The “reign” of God is a gender-neutral term popularized after Lonergan’s time. Lonergan does refer to the end of redemption as the “kingdom of God” in thesis 15, *DVI* 451 and 462; in “The Redemption,” 24-26; and in *Method*, 291; among other places.

²⁸¹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 567.

full communion with God.²⁸² Lonergan notes that these facts are covered in theses 1-14 of *The Incarnate Word*. Here his concern is “how as a matter of fact” Christ introduced the form into the matter by his “suffering, dying, and rising,”²⁸³ and how this way of introducing the form is fittingly produced “in such a way as to be in keeping with the [human] apprehension of reason and the goodness of will.”²⁸⁴ He asserts that “this form is fittingly produced in them [human persons] only in accordance with the Law of the Cross.”

Thus, the Law of the Cross is a way of explaining how Christ the savior brings sinful humanity to God, how Christ the artisan builds the kingdom of God from a humanity wounded both individually and socially by sin. Humanity is the matter; God and an ordered universe are the end; the whole Christ is the form; Jesus Christ is the agent. The Law of the Cross is the way Christ introduces the form into the matter to produce the end.

4.1.2. A Spiritual Law: Supernatural, Fitting, Effective, and Universal

From the section above, we can see that conceived along the lines of Aristotle’s four causes, the Law of the Cross explains the process of a kind of craftsmanship—the way Christ the agent introduces the form of the whole Christ to the matter of humanity to produce, in two stages, an end called the reign of God. Now we turn to why Lonergan uses the term “law” to name this process. What does he mean by “law”?

As usual, Lonergan collects several meanings or types of law in order to clarify

²⁸² Ibid., 568.

²⁸³ Ibid.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., 566.

what he means by the term. By “law” he does not mean a necessary relationship or link (*nexus*) as is the case in logic and metaphysics.²⁸⁵ The relationship indicated here is, no surprise, of fittingness or positive intelligibility. But Lonergan distinguishes between various types of fitting laws. One type includes the “natural laws investigated by empirical sciences.”²⁸⁶ These laws are observable at all times given certain conditions governed by probability (prescinding from any questions of miracles).

The Law of the Cross is not such a law. It is neither an absolutely necessary law of logic nor a conditionally necessary law of nature. There is a universality to it, but not the universality of a law of nature. It is a law of “the spiritual order”²⁸⁷ provided by the intellects and wills of persons.²⁸⁸ Lonergan is quick to point out that not all laws of the spiritual order are fitting or good, for some are mere commands of an arbitrary will. To be effective they turn not to legitimate authority or persuasion but simply to power or force. On the other hand, some precepts are fitting and good, but remain ineffective and are not observed. The Law of the Cross is fitting/good and effective/universal, because it flows not from an arbitrary will but from divine authority and wisdom. We shall follow Lonergan in considering the fittingness, effectiveness, and universality of the Law of the Cross.

The Law of the Cross is not necessary, because it governs the redemption of creation, and, as we have seen, creation itself is not absolutely necessary.²⁸⁹ As an act of

²⁸⁵ Ibid., 574.

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

²⁸⁷ Ibid.

²⁸⁸ Lonergan does not mention his discussion in thesis 15 of Christ’s meritorious obedience and command, but it is reminiscent of that.

²⁸⁹ See section 1.2.1, above.

God's free will, creation and its redemption are not arbitrary acts, but they are eminently fitting, since they flow from infinite wisdom, goodness, and love. As a further act of God's wisdom, love, and goodness, redemption as governed by the Law of the Cross is fitting in a manner that surpasses the ordinary laws of nature. This is to say that the Law of the Cross is a supernatural law—continuous with natural laws, but transcending them. In particular, "in the actual order of reality the human race is brought to its end supernaturally, and that in such a way as to be in keeping with the apprehension of reason and the goodness of will."²⁹⁰

But since the Law of the Cross functions supernaturally, it is recognized by the intellect and followed by the will only through the graces of the Holy Spirit. On this point, Lonergan refers the reader to 1 Cor. 1:18-31 and 2:10-16. The first passage maintains that while the cross is God's wisdom and God's power, it appears to the "wisdom" of the world as foolishness and weakness, as a stumbling block. God chose what appears weak and foolish to shame those who seek to boast.²⁹¹ The second passage argues that just as no human being knows the depths of a human being except through the human spirit, so no one can understand the depths of God and God's works without the gift of the Spirit of God. Later, Lonergan discusses how the Holy Spirit is "the Spirit of

²⁹⁰ See, for example, *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 566:

²⁹¹ Lonergan observes: "Thus in Nietzsche's estimation Christian humility and gentleness were the religion of slaves who because of their abiding but unthematized envy of their masters' power sought to make a virtue out of cowardly servitude. In Marx's estimation Christian longsuffering and patience derive, not from God's wisdom, but from an ideology invented by the rich to make it easier for themselves to enjoy the good things of this life while the poor were fobbed off with empty hopes of a life to come. The more widely these errors have spread and the more deeply their roots have penetrated, the more obvious and frequent it has been that those who call themselves Christians concern themselves all too little with the law of Christian living" [*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 575].

truth (Jn 14:17, 16:13) and of love (Rom 5:5).”²⁹² It bears emphasizing that it is only through the gift of God’s Spirit of love and truth that Christians may recognize and follow the fittingness of the Law of the Cross. This significance will become clearer in the following sections (4.3.2 and 4.3.3) on the Law of the Cross as precept and example.

A supernatural law, the Law of the Cross is fitting in its ability to restore fallen nature or to reverse cycles of decline. It is the fittingness of not perpetuating the cycle of evil with more evil but of responding with goodness. “That is what Paul urged: ‘Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good’ (Rom 12:21).”²⁹³ It is the fittingness of not doing away with evils through power but of overcoming evil with good to convert evils into good for the purpose of the supreme good, i.e. humanity in loving relationship with God and all things, or the reign of God.

As a supernatural and fitting law, the Law of the Cross is effective and universal. However, it is not like the law of gravity in its unavoidability in the earth’s atmosphere. One cannot chose to float in the air without aid, but one can choose to return evil with evil rather than with good. God permits sin and indirectly wills evil consequences in willing a good and ordered universe.²⁹⁴ Thus, there are consequences to choices. This holds for the natural law of gravity as well as for the supernatural Law of the Cross. The effectiveness of the Law of the Cross occurs through being taught and followed. Christ communicates the Law of the Cross; he “teaches us through both precept and example.”²⁹⁵ The law is effective insofar as it is learned, believed, and freely consented

²⁹² Ibid., 586. Rom 5:5 was Lonergan’s most frequently cited passage

²⁹³ Ibid., 575.

²⁹⁴ Would freedom be real if choices did not have real consequences?

²⁹⁵ Ibid., 556,

to.²⁹⁶ Its effectiveness, however, is not limited to acceptance by the believer's heart and mind. It *moves* us:

For the Law of the Cross is *not* an injunction decided upon and issued by some legislator, which falls on the ear but *leaves the heart unmoved*. The Law of the Cross has been enjoined by our Lord and by his apostles in holy scripture. The Law of the Cross is taught not just in words but above all by examples, and those the greatest examples of all. The Law of the Cross is seen in the Head, in such a way that satisfaction is made for all punishments, that sacrifice is offered for all sins, that the merit acquired for all the gifts of grace is infinite, and that a Mediator, the eternal priest, our Lord, Son of the Father, intercedes for all who are alienated from God, so that we might receive adoptive sonship. Ask and you will receive.²⁹⁷

More shall be said about how the cross moves us in section 4.3.5.1.

Supernatural, fitting, and effective, the Law of the Cross is also universal—in the sense that it is the way that each and every human person as “free spirit” is led to its goal. In his words and deeds, Christ did not call only “a few select followers.” Instead he called the crowd, saying, “If anyone would follow me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me” (Mk 8:34).²⁹⁸

4.2. Doing Away with Evil through Power vs. Converting Evil with Love and Wisdom

4.2.1. Clarification by Contrast

We have considered how, according to Lonergan, the Law of the Cross explains a kind of craftsmanship, the way a form is introduced into matter to produce an end. The Law of the Cross, thus, explicates a production, process, or change. This change is *from* a state marked by sinful acts and the resultant alienation from God, disorder in the

²⁹⁶ Ibid., 557.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 576, emphasis added. The “Head” here is Christ the head of the body of Christ, not the believer’s head/mind.

²⁹⁸ Ibid.

universe, and division within and among persons. It is a change *for* wisdom and charity, healed persons, restored relationships with God and each other, and renewed order in the universe. Christ is a craftsman building the kingdom of God from a world torn by sinful humanity.

We have also considered how, according to Lonergan, the Law of the Cross is a law. It is not absolutely necessary, as are laws in classical logic and metaphysics. It is not conditionally necessary, as are laws in empirical, natural science. It is a spiritual law that is introduced by Christ as precept and example, a supernatural law grasped and followed by human beings only through the gift of the Spirit.²⁹⁹ It is effective in Christ's own deed and in the way it moves us to accept it in full knowledge and freedom. It is universal in that it is the way for all sinners to come to God and to help to bring other sinners to God.

How does the law function? As usual, Lonergan clarifies by contrast. Doing away with evil "through power"³⁰⁰ is one possible means of salvation, but one that God in infinite wisdom did not choose. It is associated with the "devil's way" and "human pride." This rejected way is contrasted with the actual way that Christ worked in humble service and that salvation comes "through preaching of the gospel, through faith and

²⁹⁹ This is another safeguard against substitutionary penal atonement. We do not earn God's favor and friendship through self-sacrifice. Rather, God's prior friendship and love can move us to follow Christ's work.

³⁰⁰ Advocates of non-violence tend to emphasize the real power and activity of nonviolent responses. Of course, anything achieved is achieved through some kind of power, and Lonergan uses a very general term *potentia*. The meaning is God did not solve the problem of evil simply by a unilateral exercise of irresistible will, but in a way that works with and through the wills of human persons. A human attempt at "unilateral exercise of irresistible will" might use power in the sense which ethicists term "coercive power."

repentance,” through “liberty” and “persuasion.”³⁰¹

Both methods are solutions to the problem of human evil. Lonergan’s definition of evil in thesis 16 is the same as in thesis 17. “Evil” is a lack or privation (*privatio*) of the good. In the realm of human freedom one can distinguish the evil of fault (or sin) from the evil of penalty/punishment (or any consequence of sin). Each type of evil sets the stage for the other, “both in the individual, inasmuch as sins give birth to vices and vices lead to further sins, and in human society, when sins corrupt human situations and in corrupt situations the drag towards sin is extremely forceful.”³⁰² In Lonergan’s alternative language, these are the cycles of decline, the cycles of violence and ideology.³⁰³

God could have chosen to eliminate the downward spiral of sin and evil, of violence and ideology, with force or violence, either militarily or simply by wiping the slate clean and remaking humanity in a way in which sin was not possible. “No doubt it was possible, in God’s absolute power, for fallen nature to be changed into a state of pure, integral nature ‘in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet’ [1 Cor 15:52].”³⁰⁴ Citing Acts 1:6 and Lk. 24:21, Lonergan asserts that the messianic expectations of the Jewish people at the time were different in kind than what God chose.³⁰⁵ The book of Samuel narrates a growing frustration with kings who interrupted God’s direct rule. From this frustration with human rulers, there arose an expectation of

³⁰¹ Ibid., 555. Lonergan quotes from Mt 11:29 and Mk 10:45.

³⁰² Ibid., 554. Cf. section 3.2.1.1., above.

³⁰³ See Ch. 1, section 2.3.

³⁰⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 574.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 554, 574.

God's anointed one who would restore God's direct rule.³⁰⁶ This anointed one was often imagined as king who would vanquish Israel's foes militarily.

However, such an exercise of force or power would not have been a fitting way for Israel and for humanity as a whole to be redeemed, for it would have harmed the natural created order, violated the human freedom that God willed even as God permitted sin, and prevented the "supreme good" that God has willed from eternity: free sons and daughters freely loving God and each other, "his friends, his children, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven."³⁰⁷

So instead, God chose the way Christ Jesus in fact worked, the way according to the Law of the Cross. This method is to "convert" (*convertere*) the evils of human sin into a supreme good (*summum bonum*).³⁰⁸ This conversion of evil into good is the core of thesis 17. It claims that redemption works "by submitting to evils and, by God's grace and good will, transforming them into goods."³⁰⁹ How is it that evils may be transformed into goods?

The intelligibility of the transformation involves three steps, each of which includes its own movement: (1) the evil of fault or basic sin issues in the consequent evil of penalty or moral evil, (2) the evil of penalty/punishment is voluntarily transformed into good, and (3) God the Father blesses this transformation with another good.

³⁰⁶ "The Redemption," 25.

³⁰⁷ "The Mystical Body of Christ," *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 20: *Short Papers* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 109. See also *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 446, 530, 552, 586; *Topics in Education*, 68; *Method*, 117.

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 552.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 556.

Regarding Christ, the steps are (1) the sins of humanity lead to the sufferings of Jesus, (2) by obedient and loving acceptance of them, Christ transforms the sufferings into a moral good, which Lonergan calls “satisfaction for sins” and “sacrifice to God the Father,”³¹⁰ as well as a teaching, expression, revelation, or communication of God’s glory, divine wisdom and charity, detestation and sorrow of sin, and a “new society,”³¹¹ and (3) the Father raised his Son from the dead, so that “he might revive us from sin and raise our mortal bodies into eternal life.”³¹² This produces a situation in which all things, including sin, suffering, and death, can be beneficial, a situation in which, “‘all things work together for good to those who love God’ (Rom 8:28).”³¹³

The first step is the sinful situation, the matter of redemption. The third step is the end of redemption, the blessing of the Father, the gift of a new situation in which pilgrims continue to work out their salvation with grace and the blessed enjoy eternal peace and life with God. The second step is the hinge on which redemption turns. It is a transformation of evil into good rather than a switch/exchange of the evils of sin, suffering, and death for some other things. This is a partial answer to the question: If we have been saved, then why is there still sin and evil? On this matter, Lonergan is straightforward but deep:

The redemption in Christ Jesus does not change the fundamental fact that sin continues to head for suffering and death. However, the suffering and death that follow from sin attain a new significance in Christ Jesus. They are no longer the sad, disastrous end to

³¹⁰ Ibid. On satisfaction, see section 3.2. above, and on sacrifice see section 2.4.

³¹¹ This is the focus of our next section. These terms can be found in various locations in the Lonergan corpus: teaching: *DVI*, 556, 576; expression of detestation and sorrow: throughout thesis 16; revelation of divine wisdom, goodness, charity, and/or glory: *DVI* 557, 572, 583; communication or expression of love, detestation and sorrow: “The Redemption,” 5-6, 13, 22-23; new society: *Topics in Education*, 68.

³¹² *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 556.

³¹³ Ibid., 557, 567, 574; “The Redemption,” 28.

the differential of sin, but also the means towards transfiguration and resurrection. Beyond death on the cross, there is the risen Savior.³¹⁴

On the cross, Christ freely accepted evils with the intention to convert them to goods. “For Christ’s death took place *so that* he might rise again: ‘I lay down my life that I may take it up again’ (Jn 10:17).”³¹⁵ By redemption according to the Law of the Cross the sin, suffering, and death that remain are given a further purpose. They become not the ultimate end, but the means to a better beginning. In Christ’s work on the cross, suffering and death are transformed from mere consequences of sin to the means of new life. And Christ died not simply for his own benefit. He died for us and for our sins, in other words, because we have sinned and because he wills our redemption.³¹⁶ In thesis 17 Lonergan cites multiple passages to support this, among them Rom 4:25: “[H]e was ‘handed over [to death] for our transgressions and raised for our justification.’”³¹⁷

Justification from sin and resurrection to new life are great goods, but they are not the only goods bestowed by Christ’s act. The “fundamental theorem” of the Law of the Cross “is transforming evil into good, absorbing the evil of the world by putting up with it, not perpetuating it as rigid justice would demand. And that putting up with it acts as a blotter, transforms the situation, and creates the situation in which good flourishes.”³¹⁸ This new situation is a social and an historical situation; it is the situation that reverses decline and promotes progress. Lonergan explains how this works in both the individual and society:

³¹⁴ *Topics in Education*, 66-67.

³¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 569, emphasis added.

³¹⁶ As covered above under vicarious suffering and death and vicarious satisfaction (sections 2.3. and 3.2.),

³¹⁷ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 569.

³¹⁸ “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” 182.

Sin as a chain reaction has two bases. It has a basis first in the hearts of men, where sin leads to further sin insofar as hatred arises. But Christ teaches us, “Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you.” Secondly, there is a chain reaction of sin in the logic of the objective situation, and against that aspect Christianity teaches the acceptance of suffering. “The servant is not better than his master.” “Do not resist evil, but overcome evil with good.” The acceptance of suffering puts an end, at least at one point to the chain reaction of sin that spreads throughout a society. When everyone is dodging suffering, when no one accepts it, the burden is passed ever further on.³¹⁹

Thus, the Law of the Cross is not a way of doing away with evils through power or brute force. This would go against human freedom, a gift that God wills for humanity. Instead, Christ, the anointed one of God, accepts the evil consequences of sin. He lovingly serves us even while we are his enemies. He breaks the personal chains of sin that weigh down on human hearts as well as the social chains of evil consequences that distort the objective situation. Christ responds to evil, not with more evil, but with good.

Breaking chains of sin and evil is invaluable, but it is not all that the cross achieves under the Law of the Cross. The cross does not merely stop the cycle of decline, it reverses it. How? What are the goods created by accepting evils? The resurrection is one good we have discussed thus far, but there are more, which we consider in section 4.3.

4.2.2. An Act of Divine Wisdom and Love

In the third step of the Law of the Cross, Christ’s work is blessed by the Father. This is not to say, however, that the Father is uninvolved before this step. Indeed the entirety of Christ’s activity pertains to God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Trinity as a whole is involved from the beginning. Lonergan writes, “The Son did not love us

³¹⁹ *Topics in Education*, 67-68. Cf. “The Redemption,” 28.

while the Father held us in wrath; rather, both have loved us equally in the one Spirit.”³²⁰

“It is not a matter of Christ earning God’s love for us; God’s love for us was the prime cause and mover of the redemption.”³²¹

The intentionality of Christ’s work is a divine intentionality. It is the intentionality of an ultimate wisdom and love. Accepting the consequences of sin, absorbing human evil, halting cycles of decline, and creating situations in which the good can flourish are all acts of divine wisdom and love. To wisdom (*sapientia*) belongs the ordering of things, and the work of divine wisdom is the ordering of *all* things. To love (typically *caritas* but Lonergan occasionally uses *amor*³²²) belongs willing the good for someone. Divine love wills the good for all things. When wisdom and love are *combined*, one loves rightly, one wills what truly is good for the beloved. “For that reason, wisdom and charity are so conjoined that wisdom without charity lacks effect, and charity without wisdom falls short of the right order of justice.”³²³

Christ knows and wills the true good for God, humanity, and all things. Christ’s act of absorbing evil in order to overcome evil, to transform it into the supreme good, is possible only because he is divinely wise and charitable, only because he knows perfectly and loves perfectly both God and humanity. Chosen out of this wisdom and charity, the cross reveals or communicates divine wisdom and charity.

4.3. A Communication Forming Community

All of Christ, his being and his works, are God’s wise revelation or

³²⁰ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 582. Lonergan cites Augustine, *De Trinitate*, XIII, 11, 15 and 1 Jn 4:10.

³²¹ “The Redemption,” 6.

³²² Such as on *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 580: “Proinde, amare seu diligere est velle bonum alicui;...”

³²³ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 580.

communication of love. Communication is so central to Lonergan's soteriology that he writes, "The redemption is the outstanding expression of God to man.... And the Incarnation and the redemption are the supreme instance of God communicating to us in this life.... Now that act that is found in the Incarnation and the death and resurrection of Christ is, above all, a personal communication."³²⁴

When speaking of Christ's work as communication, Lonergan means that it expresses meaning and value, but also that it gives, imbues, or endows something. This second aspect comes through most clearly when Lonergan speaks of redemption as the gift of new relationship, society, or life between humanity and God. For example, "Redemption in Christ Jesus ... comes through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, through a personal communication of the life of the ever Blessed Trinity to mankind."³²⁵ Of course, a community for Lonergan is constituted primarily by *shared* meanings and values.³²⁶ The mere expression of meaning and value does not make for a sharing of it. How the expression is given and becomes shared shall be addressed later in this chapter (section 4.3.5.1).

Lonergan's consideration of the cross as communication is spread over many works. We shall consider it loosely according to the text of thesis 17,³²⁷ but our order is the following: (1) the Incarnation as the communication's foundation, (2) the Law of the Cross taught as a precept, primarily during Christ's life, (3) the Law of the Cross taught

³²⁴ "The Redemption," respectively, pp. 5, 6, 7.

³²⁵ *Topics in Education*, 68.

³²⁶ See part 1, section 1.5.

³²⁷ In the context of the Law of the Cross, Lonergan considers communication in three parts: in the Incarnation (the Son's "becoming like us and our situation"), in Christ's life and teachings ("in the love in which he labored on our behalf"), and in his suffering and death, which we participate in and thus become "co-associated, conformed, and conjoined" to him [*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 580].

by example, primarily in Christ's death, and (4) the Law of the Cross as promise, revealed particularly in Christ's resurrection, and (5) the gift by divine self-communication of a new community.

4.3.1. *The Foundation: The Incarnation*

First, and most fundamentally, God united Godself to humanity in all aspects of our reality through the Incarnation and in all that "becoming flesh" involves. Thus, the Son's incarnation leads to being born, to partaking "in some sense" in our "sinful flesh," it leads to temptation, betrayal, persecution, suffering, and death.³²⁸ The Incarnation is foundational to human redemption, because it enables God to communicate to humanity on human terms, and because it is a divine communication in itself:

[T]he fact of the second person of the Blessed Trinity assuming human nature... was an act of communication. We express ourselves, we communicate through the flesh, through words and gestures, the unnoticed movements of the countenance, pauses, all the manners in which, as Newman says, 'cor ad cor loquitur,' the heart speaks unto the heart.³²⁹

As fully human, Jesus Christ was able to speak to us in our own language, and thus to express divine love not as (one might imagine) a distant, disembodied voice from the sky, but as our human friend who wills us good as though we were "another self"³³⁰

³²⁸ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 581, with reference to Rom 8:3.

³²⁹ "The Redemption," 5-6.

³³⁰ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 580, citing Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 9; 1169b 6, 116a 31. Surprisingly, Lonergan leaves unsaid what one would think is an important element connecting the Incarnation, charity, and friendship, i.e. that friends share something in common. Thomas, when presenting charity as a friendship with God, mentions this element borrowed from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (Bk. 9), in his *Summa Theologica*, I-II, q. 62, a. 4. Lonergan knew both works well, and, given his views on friendship and the Incarnation, it would seem to me that he would have had this in mind. But this element is unexpressed, to my knowledge.

or half his soul.³³¹ As fully divine, Jesus was able to communicate divine wisdom and charity, God's "hidden plan 'kept secret for long ages... now disclosed.'"³³²

4.3.2. *The Law of the Cross as Precept: Christ's Life*

Second, during his whole incarnated life, Christ Jesus taught us the wisdom and love of God. To relate Jesus' life to the Law of the Cross as precept is not to say that his entire life was spent commanding that people die, and certainly not that they die according to some notion of satisfaction. On the contrary, love was Christ's core teaching. Paul highlights the intimacy, tenderness, and strength of Christ's love for the church by comparing it with a husband's love for his wife, and with the love we all have for our own flesh (Eph. 5:25-30). Christ's more radical teaching is that, "No one has greater love than this, that a man should lay down his life for his friends' (Jn 15:13)."³³³ Christ's message was a message of radical love, of love without conditions, a love not for suffering but for all people despite all suffering. This is the love God the Father would bless. The divine message of radical love comes not as a suggestion but with the force of a precept:

It is the precept of loving one's enemies (Mt 5:28-48), of daily accepting one's cross (Mk 8:34; Mt 16:24; Lk 9:23), of the wisdom of laying down one's life for Christ and the gospel so that one truly saves one's life (Mk 8:35; Mt 16:25; Lk 9:24). It appears in the parable of the seed that dies and bears fruit (Jn 12:24-25) and in the blessedness promised to those who suffer (Mt 5:11-12).³³⁴

Lonergan enumerates four possible ways to observe this precept and join Christ in his work on the cross: sacramental, moral, ascetical, and physical. Sacramentally,

³³¹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 580, citing Augustine, *Confessions*, IV, 6.

³³² *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 586, quoting Rom 16:25-26.

³³³ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 582.

³³⁴ *Ibid.*,

baptism buries us with Christ to rise again to new life. Morally, we are told to consider ourselves dead to sin and the law, “but alive to God in Christ Jesus our Lord (Rom 6:11).” Ascetically, we are to die according to the flesh, but if we “put to death the deeds of the body,” we are to live (Rom 8:13). Physically, we are to die, and to rely on Christ, ““who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the activity that makes him able to subdue all things in himself” (Phil 3:20-1).”³³⁵

In our imitation of Christ, we are to demonstrate the difference between proud, worldly people who wish to rule through power, and Jesus and his disciples who wished with humble charity to serve (Mk 10:42-45, Mt 20:25-28).³³⁶ In this work, Lonergan reminds us, suffering is required. Paul cautions that “we may also be glorified with him,” “*provided* we suffer with him” (Rom 8:17. Cp. Phil 3:9-11, 1 Pt. 4:13). The Law of the Cross enjoins us to suffer with Christ, and in some ways it is the cause of this suffering, because its wisdom goes against the wisdom of the “world,” producing enemies from Jesus’ time to the present age.³³⁷

Nevertheless, we are to take courage, since “the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed in us” (Rom 8:18. Cp. 1 Pt. 5:10, 2 Cor. 4:17). And “even in this life we can learn how ‘all things work together for good to those who love God’ (Rom 8:28).”³³⁸

We do well to note again, however, particularly considering the potential abuses called “Christian sadism” and “Christian masochism,” (section 3.1.1.) that the Law of the

³³⁵ Ibid., 571. See also “The Mystical Body of Christ,” unpublished essay, 109-110; *Topics in Education*, 67;

³³⁶ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 572.

³³⁷ Ibid., 572-75, cf. 557.

³³⁸ Ibid., 573-74.

Cross as a precept does not teach that the absorption of evil is absolutely necessary, or even that it is conditionally necessary as a natural law. Suffering in itself does not please God. Lonergan is aware of the real problems caused by poor understanding and application of Christian teaching on imitating Christ's passion. He concludes the thesis with a warning of two dangers. One is in confusing the Father's role with that of the Jews [humanity] and the devil—a problem of penal substitution. The other is wanting to “follow Pilate and the Pharisees in forcing the cross on others”—problems Sölle and Brock point to so clearly.³³⁹

That said, however, the Law of the Cross does teach that absorbing evil is the wise and charitable way that God in infinite wisdom and love has chosen for the world to be redeemed. As Christ's act, it is wise and charitable, and human observance of it must also flow from wisdom and charity. This requisite love and charity, God grants us not only through Christ but by two trinitarian missions, the “visible mission of the Son” and the “invisible mission of the Spirit.”³⁴⁰

4.3.3. *The Law of the Cross as Example: Christ's Death*

Jesus communicated his message of love not simply as precept but by example—Christ enacted the Law of the Cross in the giving of his own life that culminates on Mt Calvary. He taught us in words as well as in deeds, living his own precepts and setting an example for us to follow. He not only preached and commanded that we love our

³³⁹ Ibid., 593. Lonergan does not believe that a “symbolic” apprehension of the passion, one through feelings and images, is necessarily bad if balanced by “other elements of doctrine, devotion, and practical living.” However, once further questions arise, such as Sölle's and Brock's, satisfaction is an aberration to be attacked (*DVI* (trans., Hefling), 535).

³⁴⁰ “Mission and the Spirit,” *A Third Collection*, 32. See also above, section 4.1.2, as well as Ch. 1, section 3 in which faith, hope, and love are discussed as infused virtues, a part of religious conversion which bears fruits in morally self-transcendent action.

neighbor as ourselves, that we love our enemies, and that we lay down our lives for our friends, but Christ acted upon his words.

As stated above (section 2.5.), Christ's divine status meant that he was owed all the riches and honors in the world, and more. Instead he chose a life of poverty, service, and suffering. In the end he chose a cruel and humiliating death, not directly, but in choosing unconditional love in the face of sin. Jesus knew that the way to stop individual and social spirals of sin and violence was through the Law of the Cross, i.e., through a wise and loving acceptance of the consequences of sin. Christ chose this death as the way to mediate incarnately, by deeds and example, this fact to us.

By following Christ's example, we join ourselves to him as he joined us to himself. This is a matter of what Lonergan calls "mutual self-mediation"—becoming oneself in relation to the other, in this case, becoming oneself in relation to Christ.³⁴¹

Prayer is fundamental for such a growth in relationship:

The life of prayer, the mediation of Christ in the life of prayer, is then, I should say, a mutual self-mediation. One can think of attaining perfection through suffering, which is the human lot, in terms of abstract principles, of overcoming evil by good, of transforming evil into good, of the general theme of death and resurrection. But instead of an abstract principle we have a mutual self-mediation. We choose that way because, as I have said, we choose the cross of Christ: "If any man would come after me, let him take up his cross daily and follow me."³⁴²

No less essential than prayer for following Christ's example is the church and its social and historical mediation of Christ's words and deeds. For "the challenge of

³⁴¹ This self-mediation and self-becoming is mutual, but it is not a relationship of equals. Christ, however, does become himself in relation to us, having chosen a life of poverty, a death on the cross, etc. See section 2.5., above, and "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer," 180-181.

³⁴² "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer," 181. Quote from Lk. 9:23.

the Word radiates to the ends of the earth only through human mediation,”³⁴³ “salvation comes to individuals through the preaching of the gospel,”³⁴⁴ and “as much as ever, one needs the word—the word of tradition that has accumulated religious wisdom, the word of fellowship that unites those that share the gift of God’s love, the word of the gospel that announces that God has loved us first and, in the fullness of time, has revealed that love in Christ crucified, dead, and risen.”³⁴⁵ Furthermore, “The example of Christ in his life, in his suffering and death, is set before us through all our religious teaching.”³⁴⁶

Through the gospels, prayer, the Christian community, and God’s grace, we can learn and follow Christ’s example and grow in union with him. However, no matter how far we advance, the Law of the Cross is not carried out in the same manner in us as in Christ. Christ’s work is not that of a mere example, nor is his act entirely duplicable. Jesus is the cause of the Law of the Cross, and we are primarily the effect of it—though to some degree in observing the precept and following Christ’s example, we are participants in its causation. Additionally, Christ is perfect before the transformation enacted by the law, while we are perfected through it. Jesus took the evils of punishment freely, while we justly incur punishments, though we may take some on freely through the Spirit’s aid of grace. Finally, the gifts produced by the law are Christ’s by virtue of his being a divine person, while they are disproportionate to us and become ours only by grace.³⁴⁷

³⁴³ “The Response of the Jesuit,” *A Second Collection*, 175. This statement raises questions about salvation outside the church, questions that are beyond the scope of this dissertation.

³⁴⁴ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 555.

³⁴⁵ *Method*, 113.

³⁴⁶ “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” 177.

³⁴⁷ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 577-78. See also 557.

4.3.4. *The Law of the Cross as Promise: Christ's Resurrection*

Without the resurrection, Christ's suffering and death for us and for our sins would not be a narrative of glory but merely a story of sorrow. The crucifix displayed by Christians would not be a symbol of God's love and wisdom but a memorial to tragedy. Thankfully, however, God the Father blessed his Son's meritorious choice to love without reserve. And now Christians understand the resurrection to be the essential outcome of Christ crucified. "Beyond death on the cross, there is the risen Savior."³⁴⁸

As the "principal instance" of the third step in the Law of the Cross,³⁴⁹ Christ's resurrection gives his death its intended purpose: "For Christ's death took place *so that* he might rise again: 'I lay down my life that I may take it up again' (Jn 10:17)."³⁵⁰ Christ's resurrection is the final word to Christ's life and death, but it is not the final word of redemption. For in this one man's resurrection is the divine promise of new life to all people who share in Christ's life and death.

Thus, the resurrection of Jesus is a communication that inspires *hope*. Through the resurrection Christ's words and deeds become the good news. Christ's death and resurrection are the "concrete illustration, application, realization" of the good news of salvation, the initiation of the reign of God.³⁵¹ In the reign of God, divine wisdom and love are in charge. Even sin and death can lead to good. Christ's death and resurrection communicate this fact:

What was Christ doing by dying and rising again? He was overcoming in himself, and also through his followers, all the evils in the world, and overcoming them to rise again,

³⁴⁸ *Topics in Education*, 67.

³⁴⁹ *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 579.

³⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 569, emphasis added.

³⁵¹ "The Redemption," 26-27.

that by his resurrection we might know and realize and act upon those words of St. Paul in Romans, chapter 8, verse 28, “To those that love God, all things conspire unto the good.”³⁵²

With the knowledge that in the resurrection sin and death are overcome, Christians are given the hope that enables them to follow Christ and to reverse cycles of decline:

The death and resurrection of Christ express the victory of truth and goodness in spite of every kind of suffering... The example of Christ and the grace of God that comes to us through Christ constitute a historical force that, in Christ’s own words amounts really to this: Fear not, I have overcome the world.... It is this Christian hope that is the supreme force in history. It is a fundamental and unchangeable ground that enables ordinary mortals to stand by the truth and stand by what is right, no matter what the consequences.³⁵³

The resurrection is not only the promise but also the object of Christian hope.

Christ’s resurrection is the promise, but our hope is for our own resurrection. Lonergan understands Christian resurrection in multiple ways: “There is the symbolic death of baptism and the symbolic life of the Eucharist; there is the ascetic death of mortification, of dying to sin, and the ascetic resurrection of the exercise of virtue.”³⁵⁴ Ultimately, however, the resurrection we hope for is a bodily resurrection after physical death. This resurrection is eschatological. It comes, not in this world, but in the world to come.³⁵⁵

4.3.5. *Divine Love and the New Society*

Redemption according to Lonergan is a personal communication given in Christ’s incarnation, life, death, and resurrection. “It is an act of human communication performed

³⁵² Ibid., 28.

³⁵³ *Topics in Education*, 257

³⁵⁴ Ibid., 67.

³⁵⁵ “The Redemption,” 17. Cf. *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 559, where Lonergan cites church doctrine on the resurrection of the body: DB 2, 6, 86; DS 11, 30, 150. Lonergan does not discuss specifics about the resurrected body, to my knowledge.

by a divine person.”³⁵⁶ It is a personal communication in two senses, both as incarnate meaning and as self-gift. In both senses redemption as communication forms community.

4.3.5.1. Bringing Out Love by Incarnate Meaning

Earlier,³⁵⁷ we quoted Lonergan as stating that when made out of charity, satisfaction for one’s enemy’s offenses (whether by Christ or a Christian participating in Christ’s work) can “bring out” love in one’s enemy and create a mutually loving relationship. The same is true under the Law of the Cross. Accepting the evil consequences of sin can be a wise way of communicating love and drawing forth love from one who does not love, i.e., a sinner or enemy. But how does this bringing out or drawing forth work?

This question is important because, as mentioned in section 3.2., there is the pitfall of exemplarism, by which Christ’s work is thought to have been simply a positive example. Among the various ways Lonergan guards against exemplarism is his affirmation that Christ’s example, Christ’s communication, brings or draws out a loving response in the sinner. The question is, how does this work? Lonergan does not answer the question explicitly, but I believe that what he calls “incarnate meaning” provides an answer. Meaning is an important part of human existence. It connects with the natural human desire to know and to follow the true and the good. It guides human activity and builds human community. Incarnate meaning is a special type of meaning with a central role in human living.

³⁵⁶ “The Redemption,” 5.

³⁵⁷ Section 3.2.2.2.

Lonergan asserts that Christ's work of redemption is communicated both in word and deed, in other words, by both "linguistic meaning" and "incarnate meaning." The linguistic meaning of the gospels is "endlessly reinforced by the incarnate meaning to be contemplated in the life and ministry and, above all, in the suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ."³⁵⁸ Incarnate meaning is the way "heart speaks to heart." "It can be at once intersubjective, artistic, symbolic, linguistic. It is the meaning of a person, of his way of life, of his words, or his deeds."³⁵⁹ This is the "incarnate intelligibility" (section 1.2.3.) that "exploits all the subtle relations that hold between body and mind, between flesh and spirit."³⁶⁰

For Lonergan, the whole person as body and mind is physical, sensing, spontaneously intersubjective, imaginative, inquisitive, intelligent, reasonable, feeling, and committed. Christ crucified appeals to all aspects of the human person. The meaning he mediates on the cross is, thus, an incarnate meaning that moves us physically, sensibly, in our deep desires and fears, our imaginations, our senses of wonder, our desires for understanding and truth, our capacities for feeling and commitment.

An important part of the reason why the cross moves us is the natural human desire for truth, goodness, and love. This desire is not simply a desire to *know* and to *feel* truth, goodness, and love. It extends from the cognitive realm to the moral and social realms. Lonergan affirms that part of human nature is the desire to *be*, to *act* and to *live* in accordance with truth, goodness, and love. Finally, we have a desire to know, to feel,

³⁵⁸ "The Response of the Jesuit," 175.

³⁵⁹ *Method*, 73.

³⁶⁰ "The Redemption," 10.

to be, to act, and to live according to ultimate truth, unconditional goodness, and otherworldly love. This is a desire for what Lonergan calls self-transcendence as intellectual, moral, and religious.³⁶¹ When sin has affected the person and the community, then self-transcendence becomes a matter of conversion.³⁶² As a communication of incarnate meaning by a divine person, the cross meets human persons in their transcendent desire for intellectual, moral, and religious fulfillment.

This is true not simply about abstract, general natures, but about concrete human persons. In Christ's incarnation, life, death, and resurrection there is a personal message for each person at each moment of his/her life. When meditating on these mysteries, "each must take from it his [or her] own fruit... the thoughts that come to him, the affectations aroused in his heart, the acts of will that arise, that are presented as possibilities to his freedom."³⁶³ We come to know Christ "not as apprehended by the apostles, by Paul and John, by the church, by Christ himself, by the Spirit; it is our *own* apprehension of him. It is, as it were, putting on, acquiring our own view of him. We put on Christ in our own way, in accord with our own capacities and individuality, in response to our own needs and failings."³⁶⁴

The cross as incarnate meaning meets each of us where s/he is. In a personal way, it draws forth from the peak of our selves a self-transcendent love. There is something in

³⁶¹ See part 1, particularly section 1.4.2. On this natural desire to be, act, and live according to truth, goodness, and value, Lonergan writes, "For we are so *endowed* that we not only ask questions leading to self-transcendence, not only can we recognize answers constitutive of intentional self-transcendence, but also respond with *the stirring of our very being* when we glimpse the possibility or the actuality of moral self-transcendence" (*Method*, 38, emphasis added).

³⁶² See part 1, particularly section 3.2.1.

³⁶³ "The Redemption," 7. Lonergan acknowledges his dependence on Ignatius of Loyola's Spiritual Exercises.

³⁶⁴ "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer," 180.

our very makeup, in our natural desires and personal characters, that Christ on the cross appeals to, connects with, and draws forth in an appropriate response. From the cross, Christ communicates an interpersonal invitation to transcend ourselves in an interpersonal way. Specifically, this communication is of the condemnation of human sin and the love of God despite sin. This communication invites us to respond to Christ's condemnation of sin with repentance and to Christ's love with our own love. This love, like all loves, bears consequences on the way "from above downwards" (part 1, chapter 1, section 1.5.2.). It shifts all of our commitments. It bears fruit in judgments of truth and value, in new questions, and new insights. It opens up new ways of experiencing the world. We become new persons, renewed by the incarnate meaning, the divine wisdom and love that Christ incarnates for us on the cross.

The cross is a communication, but it is not a mere communication. It moves us with a meaning that is both transcendent and incarnate. But it is an invitation, for it meets us where we are, as chained by sin yet yearning for righteousness. It works not by necessity and power, doing away with human freedom, but in a way that *fits* with human desires and human freedom, as incarnate communication and moving invitation.

4.3.5.2. Self-Communication for Life in the Trinity

Christ Jesus, moved out of love for us, chose to be who he was for us. So we too, moved by love for him, can choose to become conformed to Christ and to live a renewed life in him. This conformity to Christ is not merely the product of our choice. The incarnate meaning of his life, death, and resurrection moves us with the power of God's love (see "religious conversion" in chapter. 1, section 3.2.1.). Furthermore, the cross

does not merely mediate a profound and moving incarnate meaning. Christ's communication on the cross is a communication in the sense of "imbuing," "implanting," or "infusing." God gives God's *self* to us in redemption.³⁶⁵ By this self-gift human persons are healed of sin and become part of a new society, sharing the life of the Blessed Trinity and enjoying healed relationships with one another.

First, in the Incarnation, God has communicated not simply an intellectually-graspable fact: that God loves us. Rather, through Christ we are given the Love by which God loves God:

Because God became man, the love of God for God became the love of God for man. Because love is for a person, when God became man, when the Word was made Flesh, divine love broke the confines of divinity to love a created humanity in the manner that God the Father loves God the Son.... This love, then, is the love of God for God. Moreover, it too is God, God the Holy Ghost, who is the infinite love proceeding from the infinite loveliness of God.³⁶⁶

In redemption the Father has loved us so much as to send his Son. The Son has become one with humanity, sharing in our situation and loving us even unto death. The Father has blessed the Son's death with resurrection and with gifts that extend shared nature and friendship to all of humanity. Through this we are given the gift of God's Love, the Holy Spirit. Lonergan discusses this process with a quote from scripture:

"In the fullness of time, God sent his Son, born of woman, made under the law, that those who were under the law might be redeemed and receive the adoption of sons. And now that you are sons, to show that you are sons, he sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying; Abba, Father!" (Galatians 4.4-6). The mission of the Son and the mission of the Holy Ghost is the basis of a new society in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in which there is communicated to us personally, through the person of the Son and through the person of the Spirit, a participation of divine perfection, a participation of the order of truth and love that binds the three persons of the Blessed Trinity.³⁶⁷

³⁶⁵ Ibid., 6.

³⁶⁶ "The Mystical Body of Christ," 107.

³⁶⁷ *Topics in Education*, 68.

In giving us some participation in the life of the Trinity, Christ and the Spirit that he sends bring us to closer relationship with the Father, so that in sum we become “temples of Christ’s Spirit, members of his body, adopted children of the Father.”³⁶⁸ Participation in the life of the Trinity is not something held off to the future, but it is now, “part of our concrete reality,” “the fundamental fact about us.”³⁶⁹

Through this participation in the life of the Trinity we are given many gifts; “there is implanted within us a new principle of a higher life and from it there flow the infused virtues and gifts of the Holy Ghost.”³⁷⁰ This new life and these new gifts are the basis of a new society, not only with God but also with other human beings as members of the body of Christ.

This life, these virtues, and this society are ours, not by nature but by grace.³⁷¹ Initially they are a reality that is immediate but not known or developed. It is only through prayer and perseverance that this life becomes known and these virtues become practiced with spontaneity and consistency.³⁷²

The “guiding thread” in all of this—through the Incarnation, the precept and example of Christ, the promise and hope for the resurrection, God’s self-gift and the graces we come slowly to know and to practice—is love.³⁷³ Love is central from the beginning through the end of redemption:

³⁶⁸ “Existenz and Aggiornamento,” an address given At Regis College, Willowdale, Ontario in 1964, published in *Collection* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 249. See also “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” 178-79.

³⁶⁹ “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” 179-180.

³⁷⁰ “The Mystical Body of Christ,” 109.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 108-111; “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” 178.

³⁷² “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” 178; “The Mystical Body of Christ,” 5.

³⁷³ “The Mystical Body of Christ,” 106.

Hence the great commandment is to love God with all one's heart and all one's soul, with all one's mind and all one's strength. And the second is like unto the first, to love one's neighbor as oneself, to love one another as Christ has loved us, toward the fulfillment of Christ's prayer at the last Supper: "I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be completely made one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me and that Thou hast loved them as Thou hast loved me" [John 17:23].³⁷⁴

Christ's prayer has been answered. His work is done. However, redemption is achieved in two stages.³⁷⁵ The reign of God is both at hand and still to come. Though its fullness is eschatological, there is already a new society of humanity reconciled in love to God and each other. This new community, this new set of right relations is the "supreme good," the good for which Christ worked "according to the just and mysterious Law of the Cross."

³⁷⁴ "The Mystical Body of Christ," 111.

³⁷⁵ The fullness of this reality, is, of course, in the life to come, the second stage of redemption as end. *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 481. Cf. "Mission and the Spirit," 26.

Conclusion

In this part we have sought to understand Lonergan's understanding of redemption, particularly his understanding of the role of the crucifixion. Redemption through Christ Jesus is a mystery that has been revealed. Through the grace of faith and the natural gifts of reason, one can seek a fruitful understanding of this mystery through an analogy with natural things and in relation to other revealed mysteries and our ultimate end. This was our method.³⁷⁶

We have not, however, sought a perfect or comprehensive understanding of the mystery. With Lonergan, we have considered the intelligibility of redemption as fitting, dynamic, incarnate, complex, and multiple. We have examined the basic but fundamental ways of understanding Christ's work, ways presented by scripture and tradition, namely redemption, paying a price, vicarious suffering and death, sacrifice, meritorious obedience, the risen lord, and eternal priest. We have distinguished two possible theories for understanding these diverse scriptural analogies as a united whole: Anselm's theory of satisfaction versus its problematic aberration, called substitutionary penal atonement or satisfassion.

In the third and fourth chapters, we studied Lonergan's two privileged analogies for understanding Christ's work on the cross. These analogies are higher viewpoints or

³⁷⁶ The analogies of nature include the revealed analogies of thesis 15, satisfaction, and the Law of the Cross. These were our focus, but other mysteries, such as the Incarnation, the resurrection, and the mission of the Spirit, played important roles. Of course, the cross's role in redemption as means was considered in relation to redemption as our ultimate end—the loving relationship with God, each other, and all things, i.e., the reign of God.

larger contexts within which the various aspects of redemption become related as a whole. The first analogy is satisfaction. For Lonergan, satisfaction is not simply the payment of a debt. It is an expression of a person's soul that is intended to create a concord of wills and the union of persons. When one has done something wrong and offended another person, one might rub it in, but the better response is to express a heartfelt detestation of the wrong and sorrow for the harm it has caused. Furthermore, one could be punished in retribution. The better way, however, is to ask for pardon and to make that request more appropriate by willingly taking on the consequences of one's actions. This better way is satisfaction.

Christ's work on the cross is satisfaction. But it is satisfaction of a particular kind. Christ offers vicarious satisfaction—the satisfaction for another's offense—and he does it not merely for those friendly to him, but for those who act as his enemies, for all of us in our sinfulness. Christ's work is not intended to appease God; on the contrary, it is motivated by God. It is a divine initiative. Fully divine and fully human, Jesus Christ knows human sin in the entirety of its intrinsic evil and in the evil of its consequences, particularly the way sin ruptures our relationships with God, with ourselves, and with each other. Moved by a perfect knowledge of sin and its consequences and by a perfect love for God and humanity, Christ is able to offer a satisfaction that encompasses all sins. He is able to feel and to express perfect detestation of sins and perfect sorrow for the damage that they do.

Furthermore, moved by this knowledge and this love, Christ expresses his perfect detestation and sorrow in a manner that is perfectly fitting—on the cross. Instead of

responding to evil with evil, Jesus accepted the consequences of our sins. He broke the chain reaction of sin and violence. Instead of doing away with evil by coercive force or magical power, he wisely and lovingly accepted the consequences of sin. He acted not out of defeat but out of hope and prayer. Accepting the evils of sin, he overcame them. He converted them into the means for new life and new community, namely, a communication of God's wisdom and love. Christ on the cross communicates the order of the universe, an order in which good leads to good, good can choose to sin, sin leads to evil consequences, and sinful consequences can be transformed into good. Christ on the cross transforms suffering and death into a communication of Love that invites us and inspires us to repent of our sins, to love God and all things, and to follow him in his work of overcoming evil with good, thus reversing decline, liberating progress, and mediating redemption. This is the Law of the Cross, the law Christ decreed as precept and example, by both linguistic and incarnate word.

The Law of the Cross explains not only *how* we are redeemed, but *why* we are redeemed in this way. Our God is infinitely wise and good. This is the world which God has chosen from among all possible worlds. It works not through universal, necessary laws but through emergent probability. Human persons are essentially intelligent and free, capable of discovering and directing their/our progress. Human nature is good in potential and desire, but it is open to sin and bias. Sin, bias, and their evil consequences dispose human persons to further sin and shrink their horizons of concern. God's grace breaks through the harmful and cumulative effects of sin, liberating human society and

human hearts and minds by a threefold conversion, particularly by faith, hope, and love.

Christ's work on the cross is the focal point of redemption.

The Law of the Cross works with emergent probability. It shifts probabilities from a tendency to do evil to a tendency to do good. It is a mediation and an object of faith, hope, and love, grounding the conversions and liberating from sin and bias the good, natural, human orientation toward self-transcendence on physical, intellectual, emotional, existential, social, historical, and religious levels.

Because God willed the good of human freedom and a just world order, God permitted sin and indirectly willed the harmful consequences of sin. The redemption that God has chosen does not destroy a fallen nature and start anew. Rather, God has chosen to redeem nature by working with nature through the Law of the Cross. Furthermore, God did not have to redeem this fallen world, and God did not have to redeem it on the cross. Nevertheless, from all possible means of redemption, God—in infinite wisdom and charity—chose the cross. God chose this way because it is the wisest and the most loving way. It fits with the order God has willed for creation since its beginning (a dynamic, interdependent hierarchy governed by emergent probability), and it fits with the end that God has in store (that all things be one with God in love).

It is this final end that makes Christ's work on the cross most fitting. The redemption that God has willed from eternity out of infinite love and wisdom is not the creation of automatons that do God's will by necessity, but free sons and free daughters

who freely love God, each other, and all things.³⁷⁷ This is the supreme good, the final end of creation. Because God willed that through love we might share in the divine life and become co-creators of a community bound by love, God willed human persons to be free, and God willed to redeem us from the aberrations of our freedom not by destroying our freedom but by working with our freedom, by communicating incarnately, and by inviting us lovingly into a redemption that is reconciliation

³⁷⁷ “[F]aith recognizes that God grants men their freedom, that he wills them to be persons and not just his automata, that he calls them to the higher authenticity that overcomes evil with good” (*Method*, 117). See note 307, above, and part 1, section 3.3.2.

Conclusion

In the introduction, as well as at other points in this dissertation, I have asserted that my purpose is not so much to judge the merits of Lonergan's understanding of how Christ's suffering and death saves as simply to understand his understanding. In this conclusion, however, I would like to provide a brief assessment of what I find to be the strengths in Lonergan's thought. This assessment will consider two parts: first, the harmony of Lonergan's cosmology and anthropology with his soteriology, and second, the pastoral/practical helpfulness of Lonergan's soteriology for Christian discipleship.

In my opinion, there is a real beauty to the way Lonergan's soteriology functions in relation to his cosmology and anthropology, and vice versa. As Lonergan indicates in Thesis 17 of *De Verbo Incarnato*, to solve the problem of human sin, God could have totally destroyed creation and started anew. But in infinite wisdom and love, God thought it fitting instead to work redemption in harmonious continuity with the order of the cosmos as God created/creates it.

We can imagine God "up there" horrified that creation has gone wrong "after" it has been made, but this is not the way Lonergan would have it. As he writes in *Insight*, "There are no divine afterthoughts."¹ God did not choose to solve the problem of evil after realizing God has "messed up." Rather, from the beginning, from all eternity, God has willed this creation, and this redemption. From all possible world orders and all

¹ *Insight*, 717, cf. 718.

possible solutions to the problems of this world order, this order and this redemption are the ones that God has chosen from eternity out of infinite love and wisdom.

God did not choose to eliminate the evils of human sin through a simple, coercive power, because that would not have been compatible with God's original intention for creation and humanity. God did not will a clockwork creation governed simply by absolute, universal, necessary rules, and God did not will a humanity that automatically chooses the good. Instead, God willed that the world be governed by emergent probability, and that human beings be given freedom. This nature, according to Lonergan, God willed directly, and it is good. But in willing freedom, God allowed/allows the possibility of sin and evil. God does not will these things, but permits them, because God wills freedom.

Why would God permit sin and evil in willing freedom? An intelligible answer can be given only in light of, or in relation to, the ultimate purpose of creation. For Lonergan, God's ultimate intention in creating human freedom and a world order of emergent probability is the eventual emergence of the union of all things with God, particularly a union of human life with the divine life through free, cooperative love. This, for Lonergan, is the "supreme good" in light of which God's permission of sin makes sense.²

Consequently, the redemption works in harmonious continuity with the structure of creation as a whole as well as with the human person and the human community as

² "The Mystical Body of Christ," *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 20: *Short Papers* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 108-109. See also *DVI* (trans., Hefling), 446, 530, 552, 586; *Topics in Education*, 68; *Method*, 117.

they exist in history. Fundamentally, the world order as Lonergan conceives of it is one of cooperation. Things and events on the lowest, earliest levels of creation work together in intelligible relationships that are more or less probable to form recurrent cycles that set the conditions for the emergence of higher levels of things, events, and recurrent cycles. The higher depends on the lower for its emergence and survival, but the higher also takes up the lower into more complicated, more integrated patterns of cooperative relationality. So chemical conditions set the stage for biological systems, and chemical and biological systems set the stage for psychological, spiritual, and communal systems. Higher systems depend on the lower for their proper functioning, but they also make the lower capable of leaps in capacity. Thus, carbon and oxygen are not capable on their own of sensing, questioning, thinking, feeling, deciding, loving, and building communities based on these operations, but in human persons they become capable of this.

The human person, for Lonergan, is a part of an emergently probable world order. But s/he is a special part of that order, capable to some degree of discovering and directing the development of that order. Such human-directed development is through the transcendental method and the cooperative activity of a human community brought together primarily by shared meanings and values. The community is not static. Through the interplay of social tradition and individuals' new insights and free choices, human communities develop in history. If the operations and cooperations are authentic, then individuals and communities will progress. If they are inauthentic, whether mistakenly so or willfully so, there will be decline. Individual acts of bias, sin, and evil

will set the conditions for the emergence of an accelerating downward spiral of lies and hatred, apathy and ideology, violence and oppression.

The good news is that while any given concrete society will be comprised simultaneously of both authenticity and inauthenticity, nature and sin, progress and decline, it will also be comprised to some degree of God's grace: the divine self-communication that becomes effective through converted persons and communities. Just as progress and decline operate according to the divinely chosen world order of emergent probability, so too does redemption. God's grace does not destroy human freedom; rather, it shifts probabilities. It transforms one's orientation from a damaged tendency toward falsehood and evil to a renewed desire for the true and the good, a renewed desire that directs renewed authentic operation and cooperation.

How does Christ's passion function in this emergently probable order of progress, decline, and redemption? Redemption, for Lonergan, is a cooperation of multiple things and events, as are the functioning of the created world order, the human person, and the human community. Since sin is primarily a human problem (at least, and certainly, in its *causes*) redemption is a cooperation primarily between the human and the divine. It is, to be sure, a divine initiative, but it is also constituted by human cooperation.

The already achieved, or "objective," elements of Christ's work on the cross are emphasized by Lonergan in his discussion of the traditional, biblical analogies. As Lonergan affirms, Christ's work is one of multiple intelligibility. It is *redemption*—the deliverance from sin for right relationship. It is the *paying a price*, in the sense of willingly taking on the consequences of sin in the context of satisfaction. It is *vicarious*

suffering and death, since Christ dies for us and on account of our sin. It is a unique *sacrifice* offered once and for all as a worshipful act directed to God on behalf of people for the remission of their sins, but *not* to appease an angry Father. It is a *meritorious obedience*, in that it is the product not of coercive force, but of a pleasing union of heart and mind, worthy of the gift of salvation. Then redemption is also a work of Christ as *risen lord* and *eternal priest*, for the resurrection conveys in incarnate meaning the truth that sin and death have been overcome. Christ as risen lord and eternal priest sanctifies us in his life with the Father, intercedes for us, and with the Father sends us the Holy Spirit, so that sins are forgiven and divine love is shared.

Including and going beyond these ways of understanding Christ's passion, Lonergan adds *satisfaction* and the *Law of the Cross*. Christ's work does not satisfy in the sense of appeasing an angry Father through the forced punishment of the Son. What is satisfying is the Son's free acceptance of the evil consequences of human sin, in an infinitely wise and loving way that communicates to God and to humanity a perfect human and divine (1) detestation of sin, (2) sorrow for sin's evil consequences, and (3) love for God and humanity. It functions in a context of interpersonal relationships by coming from and seeking to produce a concord of wills. It is the product of the union in Christ of divine love and wisdom with human love and wisdom. It is the product of the supernatural friendship of charity, the love that enables one to be friends with one's enemy. And it intends to produce for, with, and in human persons the union of divine and human love. Its method, explained according to the Law of the Cross, is to transform the evil consequences of human sin into an incarnate, twofold communication of the evils

of human sin and the goodness of divine love. It is an invitation to sinful humanity to a twofold response: the repentance of sin and the return of love for love.

The Word of God revealed on the cross is the good news passed on in history by the human community through shared symbols, texts, songs, and lives of testimony. It is the divine self-communication of divine love for human persons, a love revealed to be true and operative even in our sinful state. Its effects on human persons, the human community, and human history are pervasive. It works on both vectors of human self-transcendence: “the way from below upwards” and “the way from above downwards.” Christ’s loving passion is an historical event, one that can and must be experienced, questioned, understood, and judged. It is the occasion not only for an “outer word” to be experienced, judged and decided upon, but also an “inner word,” the word of Love that floods the peak of human consciousness, transforming us from individuals with narrow-minded bias to persons with an unrestricted horizon of concern. Through the inner word, we are given not merely impersonal data but interpersonal commitments, life-transforming world-views that provide new contexts and orientations for the emergence of our future decisions, judgments, ideas, and experiences.

Through both vectors, Christ’s passion provides the opportunity for ongoing religious, moral, and intellectual conversion. Of course, such vectors are abstractions, and human living is always a concrete composite of these components. The inner and the outer words operate not with absolute, ineluctable necessity, but with human cooperation in human living—which is ever a matter of tension between authenticity and inauthenticity. Despite the precariousness of human authenticity, it is certain that if we are

to be redeemed, the divine meanings and values incarnated on the cross and communicated in inner and outer words must become an operative source for authentic human decisions, commitments, and actions. It must be accepted by human responsibility (augmented by charity and hope) and assented to by human reason (informed by hope and faith).

Furthermore, if Christ's work on the cross is to become effective in concrete human experience and living, it must be understood by human intelligence, not comprehensively but in some fruitful measure. Such understanding is the job of systematics, as conceived by Lonergan. We have sought understanding primarily for the sake of understanding.³ However, as the introduction indicated, human understanding is a foundation for human living, both in its personal and its communal aspects.

Consequently, I would like to end this dissertation with some comments on what I believe to be the pastoral and practical benefits of Lonergan's systematic soteriology.⁴

To guide this consideration, I would like to return to the questions posed at the very beginning of the dissertation, in its introduction. There I mentioned that people find the affirmation that the passion of Christ saves humanity is problematic. First of all, given the facts of sin and evil in the world, we might wonder, What actual effect(s) has the cross had, if any, on human history? To this question, I would say that Lonergan's thought helps us to understand that the effectiveness of the cross, as mentioned above, is

³ And more as an interpretive exercise in understanding Lonergan than a comprehensive systematic effort to understand the doctrine.

⁴ Lonergan defines "systematics" as the branch of theology that seeks to understand the judgments of truth and value made in "doctrines." After systematics, the next step in theological method is "communications." This is where the continually-renewed understandings of systematics are brought to bear on pastoral and practical matters, in other words, the complicated and essential tasks of living in community. See *Method*, chs. 5, 12-14.

in some ways objective and already achieved. But in some ways, for the fullness of redemption to actually occur, there is still required the ongoing participation of human persons more or less transformed by the message of Christ's passion (as well as his life and resurrection, and the workings of the Holy Spirit). What is key for Lonergan is that through the cross, sin and evil become transformed into the conditions of the possibility for the emergence of greater goods:

The redemption in Christ Jesus does not change the fundamental fact that sin continues to head for suffering and death. However, the suffering and death that follow from sin attain a new significance in Christ Jesus. They are no longer the sad, disastrous end to the differential of sin, but also the means towards transfiguration and resurrection. Beyond death on the cross, there is the risen Savior.⁵

The fact that sin, suffering, and death remain in the world but now as the opportunity for resurrection and reconciliation may answer the question about the effects of redemption, but it can also give rise to new, perhaps more difficult questions. If after Christ's passion, sin and evil remain as the opportunity for good, then might not people be tempted, to value sin and evil as goods themselves. This possibility, Dorothea Sölle has named "Christian sadism" and "Christian masochism."⁶ Might we not value suffering as something good, to be given and/or received at every opportunity, since these become in some way the means of redemption? Might we not also, as mentioned in the introduction, fail to console and otherwise aid others in their time of need since suffering is the occasion for transcendence? Might we not think sins that produce suffering are in some way good? Might we not blame God for sin and suffering? Might God's ways not seem totally foreign to human intelligence and love?

⁵ *Topics in Education*, 66-67, also quoted above in part 2, ch. 4.

⁶ This possibility, Dorothea Sölle has named "Christian sadism" and "Christian masochism," as discussed in part two, chapter two, above.

I believe that Lonergan's understandings of both cosmology and redemption mitigate greatly the possibilities for these and other abuses of Christian understanding and imitation of the divine. First of all, as mentioned many times, Lonergan affirms that God (1) wills directly only the good, (2) in no way wills but *permits* the evil of sin in willing the goodness of freedom and love, and (3) *indirectly wills* evil consequences of sin, such as suffering, as part of willing a world order where freedom is real, justice is operative, and people may learn from their mistakes and the mistakes of others.⁷ The world order is a product of infinite intelligence, goodness, wisdom, and love. This divine intelligence, goodness, wisdom, and love is not totally foreign to human intelligence, goodness, wisdom, and love. It is like it, or analogous to it. Thus, there is no consequent separation of knowledge of divine things and knowledge of human things, i.e. of faith and reason. God permits sin and indirectly wills suffering and death, only because God wills a greater good to arise from the possibility of sin, namely the free and loving union of humanity with God, the supreme good. Thus, the divine will cannot be made out to be cruel and sadistic, or even arbitrary. God has a purpose for allowing sin and indirectly willing suffering, and this purpose is not simply God's "pleasure."⁸

Lonergan is clear that human beings, not God, are responsible for sin and its evil consequences. This is true for the workings of the world in general, and it is true in particular for the events of Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection. If we apply

⁷ "Mistakes" includes but is not identical to sin.

⁸ I have in mind John Calvin when thinking of these positions: (1) that God alone is sole the cause of all things, including sin and suffering, (2) that God's will may seem to be cruel or arbitrary according to human knowing, and (3) that this is because God's reasons are so far above human capacities for knowing. These positions come to light most clearly when Calvin discusses predestination, such as in Bk. 3, Ch. 21 of the *Institutes of Christian Religion*.

Lonergan's threefold scheme to Christ's passion we see that the Father (1) wills only the good of Jesus' unconditional and unfailing love, even in the face of sin and its evil consequences, (2) permits the sinful choices of Judas, the soldiers, the priests, Pilate, the crowd, and indeed of all of us, and (3) indirectly wills the suffering of Jesus by willing that there be real consequences to human action.

Thus, by no means did the Father wish for the Son to suffer in order to appease himself, as those whom Rita Nakashima Brock so adroitly critiques hold. Christ's satisfaction is not "satispassion." It is not Christ's pain that the Father wills, but Christ's love for God and human persons and Christ's detestation and sorrow for sin and its consequences. Christ's passion is not the sadistic pleasure of an all-powerful Father. Nor is it the masochistic pleasure of a submissive Son. Rather, it is the result of human sin and evil meeting divine love and wisdom. It is the result of an all-powerful God, but a God whose infinite power is one with infinite wisdom and love, a power so wise and loving that it chose to create human freedom and to redeem it on the cross.

Not the perverse pleasure of the Father or the Son, the cross is the communication of divine wisdom and love to humanity. Just as redemption in general does not operate by violent or coercive force, Christ on the cross chose not to respond to human sin and evil with violence but to accept our violence and to do so wisely and lovingly in a way that incarnated wisdom and love. In particular, the cross is the communication of the evils of human sin and the goodness of divine love, an incarnate communication that moves us and invites us to be reconciled with God, one another, and all things.

What does all this mean practically, pastorally for Christian discipleship? Are we called upon to imitate God's role in regard to creation? Are we, thus, called upon to will the good directly, to permit sin in willing freedom and love, and to indirectly will suffering as a consequence of sin that will educate persons to do the good? As strange as it may sound to permit sin and indirectly will suffering, I think that we are called to such action. As Lonergan writes, retributive punishment is a just option. While we cannot forbid others from sinning, we can work to create and sustain social conditions that minimize the propensity of people to sin. This is a measure of progress for Lonergan. Part of this would be the drafting, the passage, and the enforcement of laws in a wise, just, and perhaps even loving manner. Retributive punishment can be an authentic option for human society.

However, satisfaction, even vicarious satisfaction, is also a potentially wise, just, and loving options. Vicarious satisfaction is the option God chose when Christ accepted the evils of our suffering on the cross. In our imitation of the Father, we are to will the good of a loving response to sin as well as the reward of such response, to permit the sins of others, and to indirectly will the consequences for sins. In our imitation of the Son, of Jesus on the cross, we are to participate in his act of satisfaction, to act like him in a loving manner and satisfy for the sins of others, even while they are our enemies.

What is absolutely essential to such vicarious satisfaction is that it be motivated, like Christ's, by divine, unrestricted, unconditional love and wisdom. On the cross, Christ absorbed the evil consequences of sin in order to transform them into the good of an inviting and inspiring communication of love. Like Christ, we can absorb the evil

consequences of others' sins. We can accept unjust suffering in order to manifest the evils of sin and the goodness of love to others in a way that, through the Law of the Cross, will invite and inspire them to repent of their sins and return love for love.

But again, while such vicarious satisfaction is an option, it is not the only legitimate option. To be a legitimate option, however, it must be for us, as it was for Jesus, an expression of a concord of wills with God; it must be an expression of divine wisdom and love. It can never be an effort to earn God's love. We can choose to accept suffering if we are moved by the divine charity that is communicated by Christ and poured into our hearts by the Spirit. A choice to accept suffering is not necessary and it is not the only way of imitating Christ,⁹ but it can be wise and fitting *if* it will communicate both detestation of sin and love for persons in a way that would invite the sinner doing harm to repenting his/her sins and to love God, people, and all things.

These criteria do not comprise a foolproof plan, but I believe and I pray that they are the beginning of a helpful guide for Christian discernment. A complete guide is beyond the scope of this dissertation. It would be a complex project involving such things as what scholastic theologians and contemporary ethicists call the virtues, especially prudence. It would also involve a focused study of Lonergan's notions of authenticity, conversion, and "the way from above downwards." Ultimately, it would require a work just not of systematics, but of ethics, of pastoral, and practical theology.

I hope it will suffice for now to say that Christian discipleship must consist in some way of imitation of and participation with Christ's passion. The burden of the Law

⁹ Christ also responded to evil with words of correction, with avoidance, and with other, more controversial, action.

of the Cross can be heavy, but in addition to remembering that there are conditions for its application, we should keep in mind that no single person can do it all. The work of saving the world is a tremendous task. It began at least 2000 years ago (if not since the advent of humanity or earlier), and it will continue until the end of time as we know it. Because the path chosen by God promotes the freedom of humanity, imitating Christ is a humble and humbling task. It requires all the natural and the supernatural, the personal and the communal resources we can muster. With God, we can communicate and invite ourselves and others to conversion and right relationship. We can shift probabilities. But ultimately, conversion is personal and free. It is the product of God's operation and the cooperation of individuals.

Theology is faith seeking understanding, and this certainly has been my aim in writing this dissertation. To a large degree, the aim for me has been fulfilled—from Bernard Lonergan I have learned much. But in the end I am left in some ways at the beginning, with a simple faith in the goodness of a Father who loved us so much as to give us his only Son, and a Son who loved us so much as to give us his life, both with the intention that we might repent of our sin, love God, each other, and all things, and live according to this love. This is my hope and this is my prayer.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Lonergan, Bernard. "Christology Today: Methodological Reflections." *A Third Collection*. New York: Paulist Press, (1985): 74-99.

_____. *De Verbo Incarnato*. Third edition. Pontifical Gregorian University, 1964 (ad usum auditorum).

_____. "Finality, Love, Marriage." *Collection*. Ed. by Frederick Crowe. New York: Herder and Herder (1967): 16-53.

_____. "On Good and Evil." Trans. by Charles Hefling. Unpublished supplement to "The Incarnate Word."

_____. *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

_____. "Healing and Creating in History." *A Third Collection*. New York: Paulist Press, (1985): 100-109.

_____. *The Incarnate Word*. Translated by Charles Hefling. unpublished

_____. *Insight, A Study of Human Understanding*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1992.

_____. "The Law of the Cross." *The Incarnate Word*. Translated by Charles Hefling. unpublished. 93-125.

_____. "Mediation of Christ in Prayer." Ed. by Mark Morelli. In *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 2:1 (1984): 1-35.

_____. *Method in Theology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

_____. "The Mystical Body of Christ." *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 20: *Short Papers*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

_____. "The Natural Desire to See God." *Collection*. Ed. by Frederick Crowe. New York: Herder and Herder (1967): 84-95

- _____. "Natural Right and Historical Mindedness." *A Third Collection*. Ed. by Frederick Crowe. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press (1985): 169-183.
- _____. "The Notion of Sacrifice" *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 19:1 (Spring 2001): 3-28.
- _____. "Questionnaire on Philosophy" *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 2:2 (1984): 1-35.
- _____. "Reality, Myth, and Symbol." In *Myth, Symbol, and Reality*. Ed. by Alan M. Olsen. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press (1980): 31-37.
- _____. "The Redemption," *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1958-1964*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996. 2-28.
- _____. "Appendix: Three Drafts on the Idea of Sacrifice. *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 19:1 (Spring 2001): 39-34.
- _____. "Theology and Praxis." *A Third Collection*. New York: Paulist Press, (1985): 184-201.
- _____. *Topics in Education*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- _____. "The Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness" *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan*. Ed. by William Ryan and Bernard Tyrrell. London: Darton, Longman and Todd (1974): 1-9.
- _____. *The Way to Nicea*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

Secondary Sources

- Barron, Robert. "Why Bernard Lonergan Matters for Pastoral People." *Chicago Studies* 43:3 (Fall/Winter 2004): 240-251.
- Beshear, Beth, "The Problem of Desire in Human Knowing and Loving." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 20 (Fall 2002): 155-174.
- Byrne, Patrick. "The Thomist Sources of Lonergan's Dynamic Worldview." *The Thomist* 46 (1982): 108-45.
- Conn, Walter. *Christian Conversion: A Developmental Interpretation of Autonomy and Surrender*. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.

- Conn, Walter, ed. *Conversion, Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. New York: Alba House, 1978.
- Copeland, M. Shawn. *A Genetic Study of the Idea of the Human Good in the Thought of Bernard Lonergan*. Ph.D. dissertation, Boston College, 1991.
- Cronin, Brian. *Value Ethics: A Lonergan Perspective*. Nairobi: Consolatia Institute of Philosophy, 2006.
- Crowe, Frederick. *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*. Ed. by Michael Vertin. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989.
- Crowe, Frederick. *Christ and History: The Christology of Bernard Lonergan from 1935-1982*. Ottawa: Novalis, 2005.
- Crowe, Frederick. *Developing the Lonergan Legacy: Historical, Theoretical, and Existential Themes*. Ed. by Michael Vertin. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Crowe, Frederick. *Lonergan*. Outstanding Christian Thinkers Series. Series Editor, Brian Davies, OP. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1992.
- Crowe, Frederick. "An Exploration of Lonergan's New Notion of Value." *Lonergan Workshop 3*. Ed. by Frederick Lawrence. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, (1982): 1-24.
- Crowe, Frederick, S.J. *Old Things and New: A Strategy for Education*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Crowe, Frederick. "The Transcendental Deduction: A Lonerganian Meaning and Use" in *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 2 (March 1984): 21-39.
- Crysdale, Cynthia S.W. *Embracing Travail: Retrieving the Cross Today*. New York: Continuum, 1999.
- Crysdale, Cynthia S.W. "Revisioning Natural Law: From the Classicist Paradigm to Emergent Probability." *Theological Studies*, 56 (Spring 1995): 464-484.
- Dalton, Anne Marie. *A Theology for the Earth: The Contributions of Thomas Berry and Bernard Lonergan*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1999.
- Doorley, Mark. "Nonviolence, Creation, Healing." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 17:2 (Fall 1999): 97-110.
- Doran, Robert. "Christ and the Psyche." *Trinification of the Word: A Festschrift in*

- Honor of Frederick E. Crowe*. Ed. by TA Dunne and J.M. Laporte. Toronto: Regis College (1978): 112-43.
- Doran, Robert. "Duality and Dialectic." *Loneragan Workshop* 7. Ed. by Frederick Lawrence. (1988): 59-84.
- Doran, Robert. "Education for Cosmopolis." *Method: Journal of Loneragan Studies* 1:2 (1983): 134-57.
- Doran, Robert. *Psychic Conversion and Theological Foundations: Towards a Reorientation of the Human Sciences*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Doran, Robert. "Psychic Conversion and Loneragan's Hermeneutics." Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press (1989): 161-208.
- Doran, Robert. *Theology and the Dialectics of History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Dunne, Tad. "Faith, Charity and Hope." In *Loneragan Workshop* 5. Ed. by Frederick Lawrence. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press (1985): 49-70.
- Dunne, Tad. *Loneragan and Spirituality, Towards a Spiritual Integration*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1985.
- Dunne, Tad. "Loneragan on Social Process and Community." Ph.D. dissertation, University of St. Michael's, Toronto, 1975.
- Fiorenza, Francis Schüssler and John P. Galvin. *Systematic Theology: Roman Catholic Perspectives*, Vols. I and II. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1991.
- Flanagan, Joseph. *Quest for Self-Knowledge, An Essay in Loneragan's Philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Gebara, Ivone. *Out of the Depths: Women's Experiences of Evil and Salvation*, trans. by Ann Patric Ware. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Hefling, Charles. "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement: Loneragan on Christ's Satisfaction," *Method: Journal of Loneragan Studies*. (1992): 51-76.
- Hefling, Charles. "Redemption and Intellectual Conversion: notes on Loneragan's 'Christology Today.'" *Loneragan Workshop* 5 (1985): 219-261.
- Hefling, Charles. "On Understanding Salvation History." *Loneragan's Hermeneutics*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press (1989): 221-275.

- Higgins, Jean. "Redemption" in *Desires of the Human Heart*. Ed. Vernon Gregson. New York: Paulist Press (1988): 201-221.
- Humphrey, John. *The Law of the Cross in Bernard Lonergan's Redemption Theory*. Dissertation for STL at Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome. 1976.
- Komonchak, Joseph. "The Church." *Desires of the Human Heart*. Ed. Vernon Gregson. New York: Paulist Press (1988): 222-236.
- Komonchak, Joseph. "Lonergan's Early Essays on the Redemption of History." *Lonergan Workshop* 10 (1990): 159-178.
- Lawrence, Frederick. "Divine Reversal: Lonergan, the Integral Postmodern?" *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 18 (Fall 2000): 195-122..
- Lawrence, Frederick. "The Ethics of Authenticity and the Human Good." *The Importance of Insight: Essays in Honor of Michael Vertin*. Ed. by John Liptay, Jr., and David Liptay. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, who have (2007): 127-150.
- Lawrence, Frederick. "Grace and Friendship." Talk given at the Lonergan Research Institute. November 7, 2003.
- Lawrence, Frederick. "The Horizon of Political Theology." *Trinification of the World: A Festschrift in Honour of Frederick E. Crowe*. Ed. By Thomas A. Dunne. and. Jean-Marc. Laporte Toronto: Regis College Press (1978): 46-70.
- Lawrence, Frederick. "The Human Good and Christian Conversation." *Searching for Cultural Foundations*. Ed. by Philip McShane. Lanham, MD: University Press of America (1984): 86-112.
- Lawrence, Frederick. "Political Theology and the Longer Cycle of Decline." *Lonergan Workshop* 1 (1981): 223-55.
- Lawrence, Frederick. "Transcendence as Interruption: Theology in a Political Mode." *Transcendence and the Sacred*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press (1981): 208-225.
- Lowe, William. "Towards a Responsible Contemporary Soteriology." *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. by Matthew L. Lamb. Marquette University Press (1981): 213-227.
- Melchin, Kenneth. *History, Ethics, and Emergent Probability: Ethics, Society and*

- History in the Work of Bernard Lonergan*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.
- Melchin, Kenneth. Review of *Embracing Travail: Retrieving the Cross Today*, by Cynthia Crysdale, in *Theoforum*, 31:2 (2000): 250-252
- Moore, Sebastian, OSB. "For a Soteriology of the Existential Subject." *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. by Matthew L. Lamb. Marquette University Press (1981): 229-247.
- Meynell, Hugo. "The Work of Christ." In *The Theology of Bernard Lonergan*. The American Academy of Religion (1996): 119-133.
- Murray-Morelli, Elizabeth. "Ressentiment and Redemption." *Lonergan Workshop* 14 (1994): 197-228.
- O'Collins, Gerald. "The Law of the Cross in Bernard Lonergan's Redemption Theory." S.T.L. dissertation, Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, 1976.
- Neil Ormerod. *Creation, Grace, and Redemption*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press, 2007.
- Ranieri, John. "Girard, Lonergan, and the Limits of Common Sense." Second International Lonergan Workshop, Toronto, 2004.
- Ring, Nancy. "Alienation and Reconciliation." *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. by Matthew L. Lamb. Marquette University Press (1981): 249-262.
- Rixon, Gordon. "Bernard Lonergan's Notion of Vertical Finality in His Early Writings." Ph.D. dissertation, Boston College, 1995.
- Shute, Michael. *The Origins of Lonergan's Notion of the Dialectic of History*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993.
- Stebbins, Michael. *The Divine Initiative Grace, World-Order, and Human Freedom in the Early Writings of Bernard Lonergan*. University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Tallon, Andrew. "The Role of the Connaturalized Heart in Veritatis Splendor." *Veritatis Splendor: American Responses*. Ed. by Michael Allsopp and John O'Keefe. Kansas City, MO: Sheed & Ward, 1995.
- Webb, Eugene. *Philosophers of Consciousness: Polyani, Lonergan, Voegelin, Ricoeur, Girard, Kierkegaard*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.

Wiley, Tatha. *Original Sin: Origins, Development, Contemporary Meanings*. New York: Paulist Press, 2002.

Supplementary Texts

Anslem. "Cur Deus Homo?" In *Basic Writings*, 191-302. Translated by S.N. Deane. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1998.

Aquinas, Thomas. *De Caritate*, Trans. by Lottie H. Kendzierski. Milwaukee, Wis.: Marquette University Press, 1984.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Contra Gentiles*. Trans. by Charles J. O'Neil. Garden City, NY: Image Books, 1957.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae*. Trans. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics. 1981.

Bobik, Joseph. "Aquinas on Communicatio, the Foundations of Friendship and Caritas." *The Modern Schoolman* 54 (November 1986): 1-18.

Bobik, Joseph. "Aquinas on Friendship with God. *The New Scholasticism* 60 (1986): 257-271.

Brock, Rita Nakashima. "The Greening of the Soul: A Feminist Theological Paradigm of the Web of Life." In *Setting the Table, Women in Theological Conversation*. Edited by Rita Nakashima Brock, et. al. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press (1996): 133-54.

Brock, Rita Nakashima. "Losing Your Innocence But Not Your Hope." In *Reconstructing the Christ Symbol*. Edited by Maryanne Stevens. NY: Paulist Press (1993): 38-50.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of Christian Religion*. Ed. by John T. McNeill. Trans. by Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

Campbell, John McLeod. *The Nature of the Atonement*, with "Introduction" by James B. Torrance. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1996.

Copeland, M. Shawn. "To Live at the Disposal of the Cross: Mystical-Political Discipleship as Christological Locus." In *Christology, Memory, Inquiry, Practice*. Edited by Anne M. Clifford and Anthony J. Godzieba. New York: Orbis Books. (2002): 177-196.

- Copeland, M. Shawn. "The New Anthropological Subject at the Heart of the Mystical Body of Christ." *CTSA Proceedings* 53 (1998): 25-47.
- Copeland, M. Shawn. "'Wading Through Many Sorrows': Toward a Theology of Suffering in Womanist Perspective." In *Feminist Ethics and the Catholic Moral Tradition*. New York: Paulist Press (1996): 136-163.
- Daly, Robert. "Marriage, Eucharist, and Christian Sacrifice." *INTAMS* 9 (2003): 56-76.
- Daly, Robert. "Sacrifice: the Way to Enter the Paschal Mystery." *America* May 12, 2003, pp. 14-17.
- Deneffe, August. "Das Wort *satisfactio*." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*. (1919): 158-75.
- Edwards, Denis. *What Are They Saying About Salvation?* New York: Paulist Press, 1977.
- Finlan, Stephen. *Problems with Atonement: The Origins of, and Controversy about, the Atonement Doctrine*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005.
- Mitchel, Alan, C. "'Greet the Friends by Name': New Testament Evidence for the Greco-Roman *Topos* on Friendship." In *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, pp. 225-262. Edited by John T. Fitzgerald, 1997.
- Gutierrez, Gustavo. *On Job: God-talk and the Suffering of the Innocent*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1987.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *Why Do We Suffer?: A Scriptural Approach to the Human Condition*. Franklin, Wis.: Sheed & Ward, 2000.
- Hart, D. Bentley. "A Gift Exceeding Every Debt: An Eastern Orthodox Appreciation of Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*." *Pro Ecclesia*. VII (Summer, 1998): 333-49.
- Haughey, John. "The Primacy of Receivement." *Business as a Calling: Interdisciplinary Essays on the Meaning of Business From the Catholic Social Tradition*. Edited by Michael J. Naughton and Stephanie Rumpz. E-book: <http://www.stthomas.edu/cathstudies/cst/mgmt/publications/businessasacalling.html>
- Haughton, Rosmary. *The Passionate God*. New York: Paulist Press, 1981.
- Hefling, Charles. Book Review of Vernon White's "Atonement and Incarnation: An Essay in Universalism and Particularity." *Anglican Theological Review* 74 (Spring, 1992): 246-248.

- Hinsdale, Mary Ann. "To Live at the Disposal of the Cross: A Response." *Christology, Memory, Inquiry, Practice*. Edited by Anne M. Clifford and Anthony J. Godzieba. New York: Orbis Books (2002): 197-205.
- McGill, Arthur Chute. *Suffering: A Test of Theological Method*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1982.
- The New Oxford Annotated Bible, NRSV*. Edited by Bruce Metzger and Roland Murphy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Miller, Jerome A. *The Way of Suffering: A Geography of Crisis*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1988.
- Ormerod, Neil. *Grace and Disgrace: A Theology of Self-Esteem, Society, and History*. Newtown, NSW, Australia: EJ Dwyer, 1992.
- Patrick, Anne E. "Feminist Ethics in the New Millenium: the Dream of a Common Moral Language." *Ethical Dilemmas in the New Millennium I*. Villanova, Pa: Villanova University Press (2000): 127-160.
- Rashdall, Hastings. *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*. London: Macmillan, 1919.
- Richard, Lucien. *What Are They Saying About the Theology of Suffering?* New York: Paulist Press, 1992.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *The Symbolism of Evil*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1986.
- Roy, Louis, O.P. "Wainwright, Maritain, and Aquinas on Transcendent Experiences." *The Thomist* 54 (1990): 665-672.
- Sobrinho, Jon. "Theology in a Suffering World." *The Principle of Mercy: Taking the Crucified People from the Cross*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books (1985): 24-47.
- Solberg, Mary M. *Compelling Knowledge: Feminist Proposal for an Epistemology of the Cross*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Sölle, Dorothee. *The Silent Cry: Mysticism and Resistance*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Sölle, Dorothee. *Suffering*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Weinandy, Thomas Gerard. *Does God Suffer?* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre

Dame Press, 2000.

“The Redemption.” *The Teaching of the Catholic Church, A New Catechism of Christian Doctrine*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1985.